

THE  
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Nº LI. APRIL 1888.

---

ART. I.—THE PLACE OF THE HUMAN BODY  
IN THE ECONOMY OF GRACE.

*The Gospel of the Resurrection. Thoughts on its Relation to Reason and History.* By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. Sixth Edition. (London, 1888.)

THE whole controversy between Catholic Christianity and the systems which claim the title of Evangelical has reference in its ultimate analysis to the relations of the faithful, here and now, to the glorified Humanity of the Redeemer. That Christ actually conveys His Humanity to the bodies and souls of His redeemed; that in the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist we become incorporate with the Body of the Crucified; that the glorified Corporeity of the Incarnate thus actually communicated to His own is the medium of our relations with the Godhead, by which, in the words of St. Peter, 'we are made partakers of Divine Nature'—this belief is what distinguishes the Catholic from all others who 'profess and call themselves Christians.'

It is one of the commonplaces of theology that an adequate apprehension of this mystery is conditional on a full appreciation of the doctrine of the Incarnation and its consequences; in a word, that the truth of the Sacraments is a corollary to the truth of the Incarnation, that the point at which Protestantism breaks down is the refusal to follow out that great doctrine into all that is logically entailed by it.

We are persuaded that the cause of this failure is to be looked for one step farther back. There is a truth, and a strangely neglected truth, which stands logically prior to the Incarnation, as the Incarnation stands prior to the Sacra-

VOL. XXVI.—NO. LI.

B

ments. That truth—the place of the human body in the economy of Grace, as we have ventured to call it above—it is our object to present to thoughtful Churchmen.

To state it briefly as the basis of what will follow, we believe that the truth of the Incarnation, of the Sacrifice which the Incarnation rendered possible, and of the Sacraments as applying that Sacrifice—all depend on the place of the body in God's original purposes for our race; that apart from an adequate appreciation of all that is implied in this belief, we lack a basis for the doctrine of the Incarnation and of the Sacrifice of our Lord upon the Cross; that, failing to accord to the human body its due importance in God's plan of creation, it is impossible to appreciate its importance in His manner of applying the Atonement—to understand, in other words, how it is treated in the Catholic system of Sacraments as the medium of the most intimate communications which pass between God and the soul.

The task, then, which we are to be understood to have set before us is to elucidate by examination of the Scriptures the analogy between the Sacraments of the Gospel as 'effectual signs of God's grace,' and the calling and destiny of the body alike in Creation and in Redemption.

Believing the Sacraments of the Church to be the very pivot of the system which she administers as the representative of Christ upon earth, we desire to exhibit those Sacraments in their analogy to the faith as a whole, to draw them out in their true Scriptural perspective, to show that our belief in their efficacy is no accretion to the primitive deposit, to prove that a Gospel without Sacraments were a system unintelligible because fragmentary, that the Church's Gospel, which revolves round the Sacraments, is a system comprehensible because complete.

Our method like our aim will be positive. We may be compelled by the necessities of the case to set the truths which we desire to inculcate side by side with a system which has no room for them. But we would be anything rather than controversial. We write for those who must be regarded by Catholics as failing in a full appreciation of truths which, so far as they have apprehended them, they honour with the devotion of their whole hearts.

But we have another and a very special reason for shunning the attitude of controversy in our treatment of the subject now before us. Professor Westcott, as we are too well aware, would decline to acknowledge our conclusions as legitimate developments of his principles. And yet apart from his



noble essay on the Gospel of the Resurrection—which it will be seen has reached a sixth edition—not a line of what follows would have been written. That book has been the starting-point of all our thoughts: we believe those thoughts to be the necessary consequence of truths to the inculcation of which Dr. Westcott has devoted the work of his life. We cannot consent to stop short where he would leave us in the development of everything which follows from the belief in the Resurrection and the Ascension of our Blessed Lord. But where we owe such a debt of suggestion to one who would disclaim our conclusions, we desire in the enunciation of those conclusions to be positive and not controversial.

Our first task must be to set before the reader the outlines of our treatment of the subject, and we shall begin with a brief exposition of the Catholic doctrine of the Sacraments, which it will be the end of all that follows to establish. The chief obstacles to the reception of that doctrine are reducible to the single objection that they assign to material conditions a place in the application of the Atonement incompatible, it is alleged, with the spiritual character of the religion proclaimed in the Gospel. We shall therefore interrogate the Scriptures as to the place which they assign to the human body in the economy of Creation and Redemption, and we claim to prove that from the place so assigned to it there follows as a logical necessity the very function which is attached to the Sacraments in the system of the Catholic Church.

The method of our examination will be historical, beginning with the creation of man and his fall from his original status, and passing on through the Covenant of the Old Testament to the actual working out of redemption by the Incarnation and Sacrifice of the Redeemer. We shall examine the teaching of the Apostles on the application of the One Sacrifice once offered, and shall prove that the language of St. Paul as to the terms and the effectuation of our redemption necessitates the doctrine of the Sacraments as the means of its application to individuals. We claim to establish by this means that a system which insists upon the Sacraments as veritable channels of God's grace is so far from being contrary to the Gospel, or out of harmony with the analogy of the faith, that it is shown by the very fact of that insistence to be strictly of a piece with the whole system which makes up the unmutilated Gospel.

Our belief in the efficacy of the Sacraments as effectual channels of God's grace may be briefly summed up, then, as follows. The Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the relation

of the faithful to that Person, is to the Catholic believer in the Sacraments the whole sum and substance of the Gospel. It is by actual participation of that Person, by a veritable incorporation, soul and body, into the stock which was engrafted on humanity when 'the Word became Flesh and dwelt among us,' that our salvation is begun in this life, and will be completed in the life which is to come. We believe that by participation of the Sacraments we are united to the deified Humanity which was born of the Virgin through the Spirit, which was offered on the Cross for our redemption, and which now, in its glorified condition, is offered continually on high by the presence of the Lamb upon the Throne.

This Catholic doctrine of the Sacraments as channels of grace to the soul, is founded deep on the doctrine of the Incarnation as delivered to us by the primitive Church, is in fact nothing more than an application of the decrees of Œcumenical Councils. Thus, we believe that when the Word became Flesh, He assumed our human nature in its entirety. But, believing, as we are taught by the Third Council, that this nature exists impersonally in Him, we are free to hold that the Humanity thus assumed, thus hypostatically and inseparably united to Him, is capable of infinite extension so as to assume into a mystical union each individual who is engrafted into It by holy baptism. Because the union of natures is hypostatical, it must necessarily be unique in its immediacy. But since the Personality of the Incarnate is Divine, and the Humanity as He assumed it was impersonal, therefore, mediately, mystically, indirectly, by participation of the Humanity which He assumed, each partaker with Him in human nature is capable of being made partaker of Divine Nature.

Or, to approach the same truth from another side, since Christ is not simply a man who was taken into union with the Godhead, but 'the man,' or rather, 'man,' and since each of us is in our personality but a human being marked off from all others by the individuality of our finite existence, therefore none other than Jesus Christ, the Incarnate, can be immediately One with Almighty God, partaker of Divine Nature directly. But by the worthy participation of the Sacraments as ministered in the mystical Body, we can each of us be made partaker of Divine Nature, through the medium of the Humanity which It assumed.

The Divine Corporeity of the Saviour communicated to the faithful by these means, we believe to be our principle of holiness as well as our means of forgiveness. And what we understand by the grace of the Sacraments is the communica-

tion of Christ by their means for the effectuation of justification and sanctification. We believe that the Redeemer thus communicated, the Divine Nature thus mystically imparted, becomes in us a principle of Life superhuman, absolute in holiness, which renders us acceptable to the Father, and capable of rendering Him true service; of which service we habitually think and speak as being virtually not our own but Christ's in us. It is true that the Sacraments of the Church are 'outward and visible signs,' that it is primarily to the body that they address themselves; but none the less are they '*effectual* signs,' so called because they actually convey to us the 'inward and spiritual graces' which as signs they outwardly set forth.

Such, in brief, is the Catholic creed as to the means which the Saviour has appointed for the conveyance of His grace to the soul, for the application to individual Christians of the redemption wrought once for the whole race. The doctrines in connexion with which we desire to display it to our readers, or rather the doctrines through which we claim to prove it essential to the Gospel, call next for enunciation in brief summary.

We go on to state, then, that in the teaching of Holy Scripture on the original creation of mankind, on the covenant by which redemption was foreshadowed, on the actual working out of that redemption, and on its ultimate and eternal results, a place is assigned to man's body in the intentions and in the methods of the Almighty which demands, as a logical necessity, that sacramental importance of our material nature in the application of the redemption to individuals which has been briefly enunciated above, and which will be drawn out in greater fulness hereafter.

And, first, the charter of man's original creation assigned to him, as his distinctive characteristic, to be a spirit embodied in matter, dependent on an animal organism derived from the constituents of the earth, for the expression, nay, we might say, for the realization of all that he is as an intelligence.

Thus there accrued to the human soul and body a place in the kosmos of the Creator, to which our knowledge can supply us with no parallel. They form a link between two whole worlds, but for them unconnected and incommensurable, as far as our knowledge extends, the world of unembodied Spirit, and the world of unconscious matter. From this unique constitution of man there resulted a function as unique, that he should offer up to the Creator of both worlds a service which should combine in its every act the homage of matter and spirit.

Man's fall was a virtual refusal to discharge the unique service thus required of him, and it carried with it, as its inevitable consequence, the forfeiture of the wondrous position which made him the mediator between matter and spirit: since he refused to offer up their combined homage, he should no longer combine their essence in his person—'thou shalt surely die,' he was forewarned.

As the fall, such is the redemption; as the punishment, such the restoration; not simply—to use a popular phrase which we would fain see banished from the pulpit—'the salvation of his immortal soul,' but the restoration of the whole creature, soul and body, to the eternal discharge of the great function for which he was called out of nothingness, the rendering of a service to the Creator in which the universe of material existence might rise to the conscious oblation of a moral and intelligent homage.

We find accordingly, that from the dawn of the promise to its ultimate fulfilment in Jesus Christ, the restoration of our embodied condition in a sanctified immortality of blessedness is the end which the Creator sets before Him in all that He is to effect for the fallen creature.

More than this, the effectuation of the redemption is a process wrought out at every stage under conditions which are nothing if not material—the assumption, the offering, the Resurrection, the glorification of the Body in which God became Incarnate.

Now if the end of God's dealings with mankind be the eternal restoration in holiness of the organism dissolved by the fall; if the means which brought about that restoration be the assumption of a Body by God the Word; if after He had become Incarnate in our nature, He offered to the Majesty of Heaven a sacrifice which was essentially material; if that sacrifice remained incomplete, incapable of application to mankind, until the Body once offered upon the Cross had been raised and glorified to eternity, then what would analogy suggest as to the means of applying this redemption to the salvation of individual Christians? It begins with the Incarnation of God; it ends with the resurrection of man; ought we then to assume as axiomatic—we shall certainly no otherwise prove—that the oblation of the Body of the Incarnate is to be applied for the raising up of His redeemed [to an eternity of embodied bliss], by means which all throughout their earthly course are to be rigidly and exclusively spiritual? In a system where a material oblation is confessedly the turning point of redemption, are Sacraments, on the ground that they

have an outward part, to be denied all efficacy as means, and reduced to the barren category of symbols?

If, apart from all previous conceptions, the problem were to be nakedly stated—to apply for the everlasting salvation of the bodies and souls of fallen men the sacrifice of the Body and Soul of God the Incarnate Word, would it be held probable that the process of effectuation would be one in which the body could have no part—that Sacraments, because on one side material, could be but ceremonies suggesting something to the imagination, not realities conveying anything to the spirit?

With this brief summary of the course of our argument, we pass on to exhibit in detail the relation of man's body to God in the economy of Creation and Redemption as we find it laid down in Holy Scripture.

It was the peculiar prerogative of our race, as it came fresh from the hands of the Creator, that there are combined in the single person of man the two worlds of spirit and matter; that in him the material creation found a moral and intellectual exponent of the homage which it offered to its Maker, till then but dumb and mechanical; that the physical constituents of the universe were wrought up in the body of man into a structure sufficiently subtil to be the servant, the expression, the organ of a free and intelligent agent who belonged on one side of his nature to the same order with the seraphs of heaven; that in him the world of pure spirit, till then unassociated with matter, found a point of contact, nay of interpenetration, with the kosmos of material existence to which the glory of suns and systems belonged.

Such was the marvellous birthright which man had to use or to despise. If in power of understanding and will he was 'created a little lower than the Elohim,' he had functions to discharge in creation which the mightiest of unembodied intelligences was created incapable of fulfilling. He was the being, and, as far as we know, the only being, who was capable of rendering to the Creator the intelligent homage of two worlds.

His fall, then, entailed more than could have been entailed by the refusal of any other moral being to discharge the special service required of him; it introduced into the creation of God a monstrosity impossible before. Man became the one spiritual being to make matter an accomplice in moral evil, the one material being to refuse the 'ben dell' intelletto,' God's free gift of Himself to His creatures.

That this is no fanciful view of the position and the pre-

rogatives of man is proved by the punishment held over him should he prove false to the great aim of his creation—'thou shalt surely die.' The punishment, so far from being the mere arbitrary consequence of the sin, was one of which the absolute appropriateness must be plain upon careful consideration. If matter was to be no longer in man's body the organ of a spiritual service, if it was to turn into an instrument of degradation to the only intelligence in creation that was capable of sinning in the flesh, then it was ordained that that conjunction of two worlds which was the glory of their unfallen high priest should no longer be maintained in his sinful person, that it should be liable to dissolution at any moment, that it should actually be dissolved in every case at the close of a period of probation. The spirit which had refused its great function was to be sent wandering forlorn and disembodied, divorced from the fair tenement of clay which it had abused from the purpose of its creation. The body which had shared in the fall was to pass into the foulness of disintegration; its materials were again to be set free to render under other forms and other laws that dumb, mechanic obedience of which alone the fallen spirit had left them capable. Such was the doom which was denounced if man, the high priest of two worlds, should prove false to the great purpose of his creation. It bears with an irresistible cogency on the question of the importance of man's body in the economy of God's dealings with the race; nay, of his dealings with creation as a whole, as we shall prove from the Epistle to the Romans. It introduces considerations into theology which might well induce people to pause before they assume as axiomatic that the ultimate form of revelation will be a religion in which the commerce of heaven and earth will be independent of material conditions.

We pass now from the fall of man to his redemption, and we proceed to prove that at every stage of the restoration such importance is attached to the body in all the acts and in all the promises of God, as can only be adequately accounted for on the principle enunciated above.

The Covenant of Almighty God with the patriarchs was authoritatively expounded by Jesus Christ as carrying with it by necessary implication the promise of the Resurrection of the body. In answer to the challenge of the Sadducees in the supposed case of the woman with seven husbands, Christ proved that the rising from the dead was actually contemplated by Moses. As the passage receives scant justice from any commentator, we must ask permission to expound it in

18  
so  
27  
if  
ha  
ch  
Fo  
ex  
de  
an  
of  
tu  
'n  
ne  
Th  
lin  
ca  
sta  
thi  
acc  
fro  
can  
som  
  
In  
by  
on  
ferr  
dec  
the  
ess  
aga  
asc  
wh  
the  
Jac  
fina  
rem  
for  
  
tak  
dist  
we  
tato  
indi  
God



some detail (St. Matt. xxii. 23-39; compare also St. Luke xx. 27-38). The challenge of the Sadducees came to this, that if Moses had contemplated a resurrection, he could never have enacted, as he did, that the widow of one who had died childless should bear children to the brother of the deceased. For if a woman has been married to two brothers, or, as in an extreme case, to seven, who shall say, when all rise from the dead, to which of them she shall belong in the new life? The answer consisted of two parts, corresponding to the two errors of the questioners. They erred as 'not knowing the Scriptures,' the true interpretation of Moses. They erred also as 'not knowing the power of God,' His ability to call men to a new life under conditions wholly different from the present. The fleshly conception of the Resurrection by which they limited the power of Almighty God, was overthrown by indicating the object for which marriage exists in our present state, the reparation of the ravages of death: 'The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage, but they that are accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the Resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage, neither can they die any more, but are equal to the angels, and are sons of God, being sons of the Resurrection.'

Thus He proved that they did not know the power of God. In proving them ignorant of the Scriptures, He was tied down by the exigencies of the situation to taking up their challenge on the Pentateuch. True, Moses, to whom alone they deferred, had not actually proclaimed the Resurrection. But He declares that the very existence of the Covenant which it was the object of the Pentateuch to record, carried with it by essential implication the promise that the body should live again. He says that Moses, 'in the passage called "the Bush,"' ascribes to Jehovah Himself a virtual promise of a resurrection when he records as a part of His utterance the words: 'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' And the words by which, according to St. Luke, He finally established the assertion, are worthy of very special remark: 'Now God is not a God of the dead, but of the living, *for all live unto Him.*'

In what sense, we would reverently ask, do these words, if taken by themselves, establish the resurrection of the body, as distinguished from the immortality of the soul? At first sight, we venture to think—and their treatment by many commentators confirms us—they appear to tell rather against it, to indicate that personal immortality, and even relations with God, are independent altogether of the body. For if God be



still a man's God after his body has crumbled into dust, and yet 'He is not a God of the dead, but of the living;' if 'all live unto Him,' whether in the body or out of the body, then why, it must surely have been asked, need their bodies rise again from the grave?

Counter-arguments similar to this would, we submit, have been both logical and obvious, provided that no deeper signification had been discerned as underlying the words. That no such arguments were adduced, that the confusion of the Sadducees was so complete that even the beaten Pharisees took heart, proves, we think, that his interlocutors at least did find a deeper meaning in the words. What, then, was that deeper significance? He established the resurrection of the body by proving that when the patriarchs were dead God called Himself still the God of—what? Of 'a naked soul' in the exile of Hades, and a handful of dust in the Field of Ephron? Of a creature the nobler part of whose being had been deprived of the organ of expression by which it fulfilled all the functions for which it had been called into being? Of one whose loved ones shall never know again the play of feature, the touch of hand, the thrill of nerve which made him their own beloved, and not another? Of one who to the ages of ages shall never present to the Creator that homage of the human spirit embodied which he was called out of nothingness to render? *No*, we say, a thousand times *no*; the Sadducees themselves must have said *No* when confronted with the question in this form, else they had not shrunk abashed from His presence. The covenant relations of Jehovah were with the man, not with part of the man—with the wonderful being whom He had made half of spirit and half of clay, that the clay, though material and perishable, might take its share in the praises of eternity. In this sense, and in this sense alone, do the words which were adduced by our Blessed Lord establish the resurrection of the body as distinguished from the immortality of the soul. But if our interpretation of His argument be correct; if all this was contained in the words when Jehovah called the dead by their names, and said that He was still their God after their bodies had mouldered into dust, then the place which we have claimed for the body in the original intention of the Creator is assigned to it by our Master himself, in His authoritative explanation of the covenant which He came into the world to fulfil.

After the firstfruits of the fulfilment had been gathered in His own resurrection and glorification, St. Paul was inspired by the Holy Spirit to develop the teaching of his Master to

188  
a  
wa  
  
wo  
cor  
hun  
It i  
tail  
wh  
the  
stat  
sam  
cap  
(àv  
'Hi  
Hin  
hea  
sam  
and  
full  
  
in it  
thei  
Cros  
abru  
ing  
in th  
carri  
His  
that  
the n  
by fu  
fact  
pang  
in th  
earne  
of the  
It  
count  
tion o  
great  
'for  
the g  
of hin  
plicity

a point of which it had necessarily stopped short when he was still 'a minister of circumcision.'

In the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, the work of the glorified Redeemer is followed out to its ultimate consequences, to a point where the immediate interests of the human race are left, we might almost say, in the background. It is in this sublime enunciation of all that the fall had entailed, and of all, therefore, that the restoration should include when it should culminate in the general resurrection, that the thesis which we are endeavouring to maintain finds its plainest statement in Holy Scripture. There are adumbrations of the same truth in other Epistles, especially in those of the first captivity, where we read of the 'purpose of God to sum up (*ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι*) all things in Christ' (Eph. i. 10), and of 'His good pleasure through Him to reconcile all things unto Himself, whether things upon the earth or things in the heavens' (Col. i. 19, 20). But nowhere else do we find the same explicit teaching as in the eighth chapter of the Romans, and we must therefore tax the patience of our readers with a full exegesis of the passage.

The whole chapter of which it forms a part is a description in its ideal characteristics of the relations of the redeemed to their Creator, as brought about through the Sacrifice of the Cross. In the midst of his glowing description, the writer is abruptly confronted with the fact of present suffering as forming one of the essential conditions of the life of the redeemed in this world. Coheirship with the Incarnate Son of God carries with it, he says in v. 17, the condition of sharing in His sufferings, 'if, as is the case (*εἴπερ*), we suffer with Him that we may also be glorified with Him.' And although, as the next verse brings out, present suffering is to be outweighed by future glory, still the thought of such suffering as a present fact leads the writer to the sympathy of nature in the travail pangs of the Church upon earth, and so to her ultimate share in the triumph which is to crown them hereafter, 'for the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God.'

It is in the inspired explanation of the causes which account for this sympathy of creation in the fall and the restoration of mankind that we find so full an enunciation of our great thesis. First, all nature was dislocated by man's fall; 'for the creation was subjected to vanity' (missed its mark, the great aim of its being), 'not of its own will, but by reason of him who subjected it' (guiltless itself of any moral complicity in the fall of its natural high priest, yet failing to find

in humanity the ordained exponent of its homage, it was deprived of the end of its creation, and reduced to 'vanity,' to an aimless existence), 'on terms of hope' (the promise of ultimate restoration when the Seed of the woman should come, followed close upon the fall of 'him who subjected' nature to this doom of 'vanity'), 'because the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God' (the redemption of mankind from their slavery carries with it the redemption of the whole universe, whose high priest shall have been restored to it again). Then, when the fellow-suffering of nature and of the redeemed has been worked out in greater fulness, there follows the crowning declaration of that to which our argument works up. That for which the whole universe is groaning, as the culminating point of its deliverance, is the restoration of its fallen high priest to the state into which he was created, that embodiment of a finite intelligence in an organism derived from the lower world, which made mankind the created mediator between the worlds of spirit and matter: 'for we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only so, but ourselves also which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, *the redemption of our body*.'

Thus the Resurrection, which our Saviour had set forth as entailed by necessary implication in the covenant of God with the fathers, is elaborated under the new dispensation into the culminating glory of the redemption, and that not only for mankind, but for the whole creation through him. With the fate of the body of man there is bound up, we are here expressly taught, the relation of all nature to God. Would it be possible to offer fuller proof of the proposition with which we set out, that the work for which God became Incarnate can only be adequately appreciated when we read it with the teaching of the Old Testament on the original destiny of the body?

But when we turn from the end of our redemption to the means by which it was wrought out, we find that, read in the light which we have gained on the original destiny of the body, the Incarnation, the Passion, the Resurrection, and the Ascension gain a wholly new fullness of significancy.

A Person of the Adorable Trinity, Begotten before the worlds in a Nature which is spiritual alone, has stooped to assume into the Godhead a Body prepared by the Holy Ghost of the substance of the creature whom He had chosen. That

Body becomes the shrine and the instrument of the homage which God in our nature offered up to the Majesty on high. In it is that offering made for which the Creator had waited throughout the ages, the perfect love and the absolute obedience of a human spirit enshrined in an earthly body. St. Paul says of the Incarnation of the Word, that by it was God well pleased 'to sum up all things' (*ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα*) in the Incarnate, to bring the whole totality of Being into a unity impossible before, since in it did the Infinite and the finite find a point of interpenetration. Much more, then, may we say of Jesus Christ that in Him did the two worlds meet whose union in our nature was the glory of man unfallen; that in Him for the first time since the fall was the homage of the material creation presented to Him Who created it by a body of the elements of this earth being made the shrine, the instrument, the expression of a Spirit of absolute holiness.

But this lifelong offering to God of the homage in which man had come short, was very far from forming the whole of the sacrifice which the Mediator offered to the Father. Not only had what was lacking to be made up; what was amiss had mysteriously to be atoned for; the Soul and Body in which God had become Man were to be made an offering for the sins of the whole world. They were offered to the Father upon the Cross in wounds, in Blood, and in death. We do not desire to philosophize upon the Atonement; we disclaim that 'forensic' explanation of it by which Calvinism has so discredited the Gospel; we know nothing, and the wisest know nothing, of how it was that suffering of Soul and Body availed for the doing away of our sins. But unless we rob the plainest words of their meaning, we must see that all through the Epistles a special virtue to atone for our sins is assigned to the bodily sufferings and to the actual death of the Redeemer; that the reconciliation of man to the Father is made dependent on those bodily sufferings; that the sacrifice offered in His death is something different from that spiritual sacrifice which was offered at every moment of His life in the perfection of His obedience to God's law.

Now it is the barest affirmation of a truism to say that the Sacrifice of the Cross was nothing if it was not material. It is true that it was the highest expression of His spiritual offering of Himself; but if the spiritual offering be all, then why should it find its highest expression in acts which were bodily throughout? Why is it that the Blood, the stripes,

the wounds, are continually appealed to by the Apostles as the purchase-money which bought our redemption?

The sacrifice by which we are redeemed was, then, essentially a bodily sacrifice.

But, again, the restoration of that Body to the Spirit of which it had been the shrine is put forward by the first preachers of the Gospel, even more prominently than the Sacrifice of the Cross, as the turning point of the redemption of mankind. The proclamation of the Twelve to the world is summed up in the single pregnant sentence, 'with great power gave the Apostles witness of the Resurrection of the Lord Jesus.' And in the stress which they lay on the Resurrection as the sum and substance of the work of their Lord, we learn how all-important in God's sight is the restoration of man to his first estate, as the link which gives unity and continuity to the whole spiritual and material creation. Why was it that they dwelt upon His Resurrection as that by which the world was to be converted? Did they treat it only as the most stupendous of the miracles by which His claim to Messiahship had been vindicated? Was it only that, marvel for marvel, the rising of Jesus from the grave with no human agency interposed between Himself, the subject of the miracle, and the Deity by whose power it was wrought, was greater than the resuscitation of Lazarus by the Word of the yet living Master?

This undoubtedly lends a cogency to its evidence beyond that of any of the miracles which He wrought during His own earthly life; but it is far from exhausting its importance as something absolutely different in kind from all other evidence whatsoever. For the difference is not one of degree between miracles more or less stupendous. It is the difference between miracles which are evidence that *He is to be believed* when He calls Himself our Redeemer, and a miracle which is of the very essence of the process by which the redemption was effected. It is not because it proves our redemption, but because it *is* the redemption which it establishes, that the Apostles lay a stress on the Resurrection which they lay on no other single fact in the history of Him Whom they preached.

This point is so totally missed in our popular English theology that it is necessary to draw it out at some length in the light of our general position. We dare to say that if a school of modern preachers were to put forward the Resurrection of our Lord as it was put forward in the preaching of the Apostles, they would be charged by a large section of

Church people with exalting the mere evidence of the Atonement at the cost of the great doctrine itself by which the Church must stand or fall. For in the popular pulpit theology of the whole Evangelical school it is the Death that was died once for all, not the Life that is lived to eternity, which is put forward as the sum and substance of the Gospel. Nay, we should hardly go beyond the bare truth were we to say of the bulk of modern preaching that it treats the Resurrection and the Ascension as being rather, if we may say it with reverence, essential to the proprieties of the situation, than as being, like the Death upon the Cross, essential to the salvation of the world.

Read the first proclamation of the Gospel in the light of all that we have said about the original destiny of the human body, and how marvellous an illumination is thrown upon it!

If the separation of man's body from his soul, the undoing of the primal unity of his being, was entailed as a necessary consequence on his refusal to offer in his own person the homage of the two worlds which he summed up, then the reunion of the Body of the Saviour to the Holy Soul which was breathed out upon the Cross is the evidence, as nothing else could be the evidence, that He was the Seed of the woman in whom the work of the fall was to be undone, the new Adam, the representative Man, who had offered on behalf of the whole race that homage which the first Adam had refused, and of which all his descendants had been incapable. Apart from the testimony of the Resurrection, Christ's death, instead of proving Him the Redeemer, had but shown that, like all other men, He had fallen by legitimate sentence under the penalty pronounced on our first parents. His rising again proves, nay it *is*, the undoing of the penalty of Adam, the reunion of Body and Spirit for an eternity of embodied blessedness, in the person of the single High Priest who had offered to the Majesty of the Creator the unblemished homage of His Creation, Who had fulfilled the archetypal purpose with which it was designed from eternity. In Him are all made alive, exactly as in Adam all died: spiritually alive, here and now, because their spirits are reunited to God; physically to be restored in the next world, because 'if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you, the Spirit of Him Who raised up Jesus from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you.'

But even the Resurrection from the dead does not exhaust the work of Christ's Body for the redemption of the world for which He died. Its exaltation to the Right Hand of God



was essential to our partaking of Divine Nature by the indwelling of the Spirit of God.

St. John tells us (vii. 39) that while Christ was on earth, 'Holy Spirit was not as yet, because that Jesus was not yet glorified.' 'Holy Spirit,' that effusion of the Comforter which is signified by the words *Πνεῦμα ἅγιον* when used without the article, was dependent, then, on the Ascension of Jesus; even as He told His disciples at the Supper table, 'It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you' (St. John xvi. 7).

The exalted Humanity of the Redeemer must receive the final unction of the Spirit, in Its eternally glorified condition, before It could become the channel of the gifts which Its humiliation had purchased for man. Space forbids fuller treatment of this subject, inexhaustible as are its interest and significancy. We can but adduce it as the final exemplification of the principle which we have been maintaining throughout, that the means, like the end of redemption, are not spiritual alone in their nature; that all that God has done for mankind is effected by a process which is twofold, like the nature of the creature who is its object; that if sacraments, because on one side material, are to be excluded from the category of means, and to be reduced to mere symbols of our salvation, then the process by which redemption is applied is absolutely different in kind from the process by which it was wrought out.

To take up, then, the position which was indicated in the opening sentence of this paper—when the efficacy of the Sacraments is in question, we are discussing, in the ultimate analysis, the present relations of the faithful to the glorified Humanity of the Redeemer. The factors of the relation are these: on one side is the glorified Humanity by virtue of Whose sufferings on earth it is acknowledged that mankind has been redeemed, by virtue of Whose Ascension into heaven it is acknowledged that the Spirit was bestowed. On the other side are those for whom He died, inheritors by their descent from the first Adam of the obligations involved in his creation, and the disabilities entailed by his fall. Obligations and disabilities alike are admitted, be it observed, on all sides, to be inherited through a physical channel, descent from the stock which has become corrupted. Inheritors through a bodily channel, by no personal fault of their own, of a taint which, though physically transmitted, affects every part of their nature, they are to be brought into saving relations to



One Who took a body like their own to redeem them from the curse on their first father, with One Who, having assumed such a Body, has offered it as a sacrifice upon earth, and has finally exalted it to heaven, that by virtue of those bodily acts His elect might be restored to their first estate.

The estate whose restoration is to be effected, it is again universally admitted, is an estate of *embodied* blessedness in which every part of man's nature is to be restored to its perfection for ever.

The question which divides the Catholic and the Evangelical schools is how the factors on either side are brought into effectual relation, so that the virtue of the bodily acts which were wrought by the Incarnate Redeemer shall be made available for the eternal restoration of the bodies and souls of the fallen. The answer of the Catholic Church is the doctrine of the Sacraments of the Gospel as 'effectual signs' of God's grace, which actually convey to the soul the graces which in one sense they typify. Every part of the nature of the fallen we affirm to be incorporated with the Redeemer by Sacraments whose twofold contents correspond to the two parts of man's nature.

Wherein lies the difficulty in believing that the process by which all this is to be effected, by which man in his complex nature is to be united to the Incarnate Mediator, may be a *sacramental* process, may be effectuated by visible signs which convey, and do not only typify, an inward and spiritual grace?

We need not dwell on the Romish abuses which have induced the reaction of Protestantism against the primitive doctrine itself.

The position which has been actually assumed, no matter what steps have led up to it, is that the conveyance of spiritual blessings demands purely spiritual channels; that to believe in the virtue of Sacraments to do more than to dramatize, as it were, certain aspects of spiritual truths, is to expose ourselves to the implied condemnation on those who forget that 'God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.'

We have tried to show that the analogy of the faith is generally against this position. But is it possible to find analogies in Holy Scripture for the detailed application of the same principles to the Sacraments as we actually possess them? We unhesitatingly reply that it is.

The whole doctrine of original sin, as held by all Western Christendom, presents a most striking analogy to the doctrine

of regeneration in Baptism. This truth of original sin, and of its transmission to individual human beings antecedently to any actual demerit, has proved one of the prominent obstacles to the acceptance of the orthodox theodicy. We do not claim to explain that difficulty. We do not say that the righteousness of God can be searched by our finite understandings. But we say that baptismal regeneration, as taught by the Catholic Church, does minimize the inevitable difficulty by showing in a most suggestive analogy that at least 'God's ways are equal,' how incomprehensible soever they may be. If we have no choice about being born into a condition in which we inherit a spiritual taint transmitted through a physical channel antecedently to demerit on our own part, still we are dowered with a spiritual grace transmitted also through a physical channel in the laver of regeneration, antecedently to any power of deserving it. Could analogy be more exact or more complete? The child who has inherited from the first Adam the doom of sin and death is incorporated into the Humanity of the Second Adam, and made inheritor of life and righteousness; and both processes alike are effected without desert or co-operation on its own part. Is it comprehensible, then, we would ask, why a faith which is sufficiently robust to believe in original sin should find any insuperable difficulty in the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, a doctrine which is its absolute counterpart—a doctrine, we might almost say, *designed* to counterbalance it and to minimize its difficulties?

But the mysterious efficacy of Baptism, as engrafting us into the Body of Christ, has proved easier of acceptance among us than the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist, or at least than what is commonly known as the doctrine of the 'Real, Objective Presence.' The reasons are not far to seek. In the first place that doctrine itself is capable, and has actually been the subject, of abuses far worse and far more obvious. Such carnalities as the Mass of Bolsena, and other such perversions of the truth as called forth our twenty-eighth Article, find no place in connexion with Holy Baptism. Then the language of our Prayer-Book on the subject is absolutely consistent and unequivocal, refusing to be evacuated of its meaning by any but 'non-natural interpretations.'

But beyond these there is a deeper reason still why the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism should make far less demand upon faith than that of the Real Presence in the Eucharist, except, indeed, where the doctrine is minimized

into that which is commonly known as the virtual Presence to the recipient.

In Baptism we have the simplest exemplification of the principle enunciated above, that the redemption of men's bodies and souls, worked out by God Incarnate under conditions essentially material, may be expected by every law of analogy to be applied to individual human beings by means not spiritual alone. The material element of water is made by sacramental application the means of conveying the gift—*accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum*. But all that is super-sensible in the process takes place in the recipient of the Sacrament. The recipient is made partaker of Christ; but in this process the element of water is confessedly nothing more than an instrument by which the change in the recipient is brought about. Metaphorically and poetically we may say of it that,

‘Seen by faith, ’tis blood  
Out of a dear Friend’s side,’

but in the eyes of dogmatic theology it is in the *use of the element* alone, in no sense in the element itself, that the sacramental mystery resides. In the initiatory Sacrament of Baptism the Divine Corporeity of the Saviour is but virtually communicated to the neophyte, and therefore the virtue of the element begins and ends with the using.<sup>1</sup>

It is far otherwise with the Presence in the Eucharist. The phrases which are used of it in Holy Scripture will be found on a careful examination to speak invariably of something without us, something whose efficacy, when it comes to be used, is not thought of as barely coming with the using, but as the virtue which results and must result from its being used, *being such as it has become*.

In every Sacrament or Sacramental ordinance, the Eucharist alone excepted, there is an act and nothing more—the Sacrament and the administration of the Sacrament are absolutely one and the same thing. Each is a ‘moment’ in the relation of heaven and earth, a moment which leaves permanent effects, which can alter the personal condition, or give spiritual

<sup>1</sup> But, on the other hand, this statement of Dean Jackson is true, and ought not to be unnoticed: ‘The orthodoxal ancients use the same language for expressing Christ’s Presence in Baptism and in the Eucharist. They stick not to say that Christ is present or latent in the Water, as well as in the Elements of Bread and Wine’ (*Works*, x. 55. 9). And again: ‘This sacramental pledge [*i.e.* the Water] hath a virtual Presence of Christ’s Blood, or some real influence from His Body, concomitant though not consubstantiated to it, which is prefigured or signified by the washing or sprinkling the body with Water’ (*ibid.* x. 50. 4).

virtue to the acts of the person who is the subject of the operation, but essentially different from the Eucharist in that the Sacrament and its administration are but interchangeable names for the same fact. *In the Eucharist all this is quite different.* An action, an operation, a relation, a state, a power, an efficacy—none of these exhaust the signification of the Presence of Christ in that Sacrament. Hence in this case, and in this case alone, we speak of the consecrated elements themselves under the title of 'the Blessed Sacrament.' Our Article does not say that the *elements* of the Sacrament, but that '*the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*' itself, 'was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped;' thus accepting, with all that it entails, the use of the term '*the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*' for that which we handle and treat. This application of the word 'sacrament' itself to the material elements in the Eucharist entails a belief in the *res sacramenti* as actually residing in those elements, and as distinguished from the *virtus sacramenti* which comes with the pious using. And here it is that the objectivity of the Presence makes a demand upon the faith of the believer so far beyond anything that is entailed by the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. The mystery itself is far deeper, and the abuses connected with it are far other, than anything which confronts us in Holy Baptism. Mystery falls, as it were, naturally into its place when there is absolutely nothing in question except the relations of a human personality with the unseen Majesty of Heaven. Of that under no possible circumstances could our senses be expected to bear testimony. But when we come to the Presence in the Eucharist, the very seat and sphere of the mystery lie in the realm where our senses are supreme as far as ordinary life is concerned. We are expected to accept as of faith not anything which is *contrary* to their evidence, as in the definition of transubstantiation, but something about which they can tell us nothing, though it lies, externally at least, within the sphere of their ordinary exercise.

And then there has grown up around this mystery the terrible rationalizing of Trent, defining that before which angels veil their faces, in terms of scholastic metaphysics. And plain men very naturally say that in their eyes 'substance' and 'accident' are but phrases in the jargon of the schools; that they may or may not stand for something which has an existence apart from our conceptions, but that revelation is silent upon the subject; that Rome has introduced them into theology upon the mere unsupported assertion of a discredited medieval metaphysic.

tic  
ba  
He  
the  
or  
sid  
me  
—  
abs  
wo  
nev  
you  
wit

up  
bre  
wir  
ing  
wh  
in v  
are  
tha  
me  
sup  
mo  
ver  
shri  
selv  
tion  
con

mus  
tism  
for  
We  
and  
as t  
as t  
1  
for t  
footi  
feel  
neve  
now  
Octo

And even worse than the rationalistic definition, the practical superstitions which have arisen from it hold Englishmen back from the faith. Teach the truth that Christ meant what He said when He blessed the bread and wine, and said that they are His Body and His Blood, not that they represent or typify them; teach that in the Eucharistic gifts there resides a *something* which is efficacious, as distinguished from a mere efficacy; teach, in a word, that the Presence is objective—do what we will there is no other word which embodies with absolute clearness the distinction between believing our Lord's words and watering them down into something which He never said—and you are at once asked how far does this carry you towards justifying some use of the 'species' unconnected with their reception by the communicant.

Our answer and our reason for it are ready: if we looked upon the consecrated gifts as having but the semblance of bread and wine, if we believed that the substance of bread and wine had ceased to underlie them in very deed, then, accepting the Tridentine definition, we should accept the practices which it brings with it, processions, benediction, expositions, in which the gifts bestowed 'that we might duly use them' are abused to purposes of superstition. But as we believe that transubstantiation 'overthroweth the nature of a sacrament,' so, along with transubstantiation, we reject the 'many superstitions' to which the belief 'hath given occasion.' The more intense our belief in the condescension which bestows very Christ on the communicant, the more entirely do we shrink from definition beyond the words of Institution themselves, and the more indignantly do we resent the presumption which takes that which conveys Christ to His own, and converts it into a show or a talisman.<sup>1</sup>

Assuming, then, that the doctrine of the Real Presence must always prove harder of acceptance than that of baptismal regeneration, we have to show that it presents itself for acceptance with credentials of exactly the same kind. We have tried to prove as regards Holy Baptism, that over and above the *à priori* probabilities that a redemption such as that of our Lord would be applied through such a channel as this, the truth of regeneration at the font exhibits a re-

<sup>1</sup> It is perhaps hardly necessary to add that the case of Reservation for the sick stands, historically and practically alike, on a totally different footing from reservation for purposes of worship. We only wish we could feel equally certain that its restoration for its legitimate object would never be taken advantage of for any other. [That in any case it is not now lawful in the Church of England has been shown in our number for October 1887, pp. 77-90. Ed. C. Q. R.]

markably close parallel to other truths on which all Christians are agreed; in other words, that it is commended to the Christian conscience by the closeness of the parallel which it demonstrates between the remedy which it proclaims to the world and the evil which that remedy has to meet.

Can it be claimed for the doctrine of the Real Presence that it runs in such parallel lines with admitted truths of revelation as to come before the consciences of Churchmen with like support from the analogy of the faith? We make bold to say that it does. And the truths to which it exhibits this analogy are such as offer a close point of contact with the thesis which we have been maintaining throughout. We refer first to the recorded facts about the risen Body of our Lord, and second to what was revealed to St. Paul about the spiritual body.

The two truths are very closely connected with one another and with our subject in general: with one another, because the Body of Christ risen is the firstfruits, the archetype, the living instance of all that His saints are to be when the final redemption shall have come for which all nature is travelling and groaning; with the general subject of our paper, because the ultimate restoration of the body lies at the root of our argument about the Sacraments.

In the light of what we know of Christ risen, it must ever be kept prominently before us that the Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist is the Presence of His glorified Humanity, and that, in the state in which that now subsists, possibility and impossibility are to be gauged by other standards than those of earth.

In the light of what we know of our own future it has further to be borne in mind, that in speaking of a 'spiritual body' the antithesis between 'spiritual' and 'real' can claim no place in the argument. It was expressly revealed to St. Paul, and it forms the basis of his proof of the resurrection, that the bodies of glorified saints are to be, like the Body of the risen Saviour, 'spiritual,' as distinguished from 'psychic' or 'animal' bodies: yet it would hardly be maintained by any Christian that they or the risen Body of the Lord were not in the fullest sense 'real.'

If these twin truths be kept carefully in mind, the doctrine of the Presence in the Eucharist will fall into its natural place in the analogy of the faith as a whole. That doctrine depends mainly on two passages, with, of course, the parallels to one of them—St. Paul's directly inspired account of the original



Institution of the Eucharist, and our Lord's anticipation of the Institution in the discourse in the synagogue at Capernaum.

Into the controverted exegesis of these passages space forbids us to enter at any length. We must content ourselves with a single remark as to our claim to treat them as connected, and must confine our attention thereafter to the discussion of a single aspect of a single passage.

It is maintained, then, by Catholic believers that the words with which the Sacrament was instituted are to be read in the light of those other words about feeding on the Saviour Himself, and in more detail about eating the Flesh of the Son of Man and drinking His Blood. It is retorted that we emulate the Capharnaïtes in the grossness with which we interpret Him; we are reminded that He told us Himself that 'it is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.' And on the strength of that saying it is argued that the whole discourse in the synagogue at Capernaum contains at the most a somewhat remote reference to the Sacrament which was instituted afterwards. It might almost be sufficient to rejoin that, apart from the exigencies of controversy, it is difficult to conceive of any commentator reading the words of the earlier discourse side by side with the words of Institution, and maintaining that the reference to the Eucharist was not both prominent and direct.

But we have not only to compare the two passages, we have to read both in the light of the other Scriptures which have been adduced as bearing upon them, the facts recorded in the Gospels about the Body of the Lord after He arose, the predictions of the First Epistle to the Corinthians about the future which awaits our own bodies. Read thus, the sixth chapter of St. John will be found to speak so plainly on the Eucharist that it will be unintelligible how its reference to the Holy Sacrament can have been held to be anything but most direct. The discourse works up to a climax from 'believing on' the Saviour to 'coming to Him,' from 'coming to Him' to 'eating of the Bread of Life,' which is Himself, or which, more specifically, 'is His Flesh.' Then comes in the cavil of the Pharisees: 'How can this Man give us His Flesh to eat?' and they are warned that apart from this eating, they can have no life in themselves. Then, finally, from eating of His Flesh and drinking of His Blood, He works up to the culminating declaration, 'He that eateth *Me*, even he shall live by *Me*.' Here the faith even of disciples is staggered:—'Hard is the saying; who can hear it?' The cavil of Pharisaic opponents called forth nothing but warnings of their peril,



and a more emphatic repetition of what offended them. The difficulties of friends who would fain believe elicited the explanatory remonstrance, 'Doth this cause you to stumble? What then if ye shall see the Son of Man ascending up where He was before? The spirit is that which quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing. The sayings that I have spoken unto you are spirit and life; but there are some among you that believe not.' They are asked, in other words, if they are offended or stumble at the feeding upon Christ while He is visibly among them as Man, how much harder shall its acceptance become when His visible Presence shall have been withdrawn; and yet it is only when that Presence shall have been withdrawn, when He is to be with them but mystically and invisibly by the power of the Holy Spirit in the Church, that this feeding upon His Flesh is to take place. They are warned that such fulfilments of His words as the gross Capharnaites anticipate would be of no spiritual profit even if they could conceivably take place.

Now do the words, 'the spirit is that which quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing,' reduce the Eucharistic bearings of the whole discourse to a reference admissible yet remote? We must fall back for an answer to this question on the twin truths just alluded to above, on the facts of the 'great forty days,' and on the anticipations of the glorious Hereafter vouchsafed to convince doubters at Corinth.

The Lord's Body has passed into a condition to which the words and thoughts of the Capharnaites stand in no true relation whatsoever; a state in which He was present when and where He would; a state in which sealed stone and closed door were incapable of restraining His passage; in which He was cognizable only by disciples, and by them but as He willed to be made known. Yet it is a state in which He shows by demonstration that His Body is a real Body still, no phantom but a thing of flesh and bones, which could be handled, which could even take food. After exhibiting Himself thus upon earth, He was seen to 'ascend up where He was before.' And it is after this Ascension into heaven and the outpouring of the Spirit which followed, that it was revealed to the Church through St. Paul (1 Cor. xv.) how the resurrection bodies of the saints are to be, like that of their Master, 'spiritual,' not 'animal' or 'psychic' bodies. With the risen body of the Saviour to appeal to, St. Paul boldly tells the doubting Corinthians that 'if there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body,' and on the strength of this revelation he further goes on to assure them that it is true of the body which we lay down in the

hope of a future resurrection that 'it is sown a natural body ; it is raised a spiritual body.' The reality of the resurrection of the body is the single position which is to be established, and he considers that he has established that position when he has shown that the bodies of the saints are to be, like that of their Master, 'spiritual'—*σώματα πνευματικά*.<sup>1</sup>

This argument carries the whole question into a region where 'spiritual' and 'real' stand in no sort of antithesis to one another, a region in which the spiritual element in the composite nature of man shall have become supreme over the 'psychic' and the 'bodily,' in the well-known terminology of St. Paul, while yet the material element shall in no sense have ceased to be real ; nay, a region of which we might say that spiritual bodies shall be the only real bodies, while it is the gross corporeity of earth which shall not inherit incorruption.

But the adequate development of this thesis calls for an exposition of St. Paul's argument in detail.

The Apostle has been challenged with the question, 'how are the dead raised, and with what kind of body do they come ?' The syllogism of his opponents runs as follows :

Bodies of flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God :  
All bodies (and among the rest, the resurrection body of which  
you tell us) are bodies of flesh and blood :

Therefore this supposed resurrection body cannot inherit the  
Kingdom of God.

He replies with *Nego minorem*, I deny your minor premise ; the resurrection bodies of which I tell you will not be bodies of flesh and blood : they will be spiritual bodies. And he establishes the possibility of his assertion by a twofold process of reasoning. First he argues from the analogy of nature with the infinite varieties which she displays, that it lies in the power of Omnipotence to furnish us with bodies hereafter as different from the bodies of earth as the ear of waving corn from the seed which was buried in the furrow—in a word, with spiritual bodies. Then he goes on to establish his position by an argument more cogent than analogy, by an actual instance in point :—'if there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body : even so hath it been written, the first man Adam became [*ἐγένετο*, came to be, came into being as] a living soul ; the last Adam became a quickening Spirit.' The possibility of there being a spiritual body is proved by an

<sup>1</sup> The 'Homily on the Sacrament' has a very strong expression :  
' . . . whereby not only their souls live to eternal Life, but they surely  
trust to win their bodies a resurrection to immortality.'

actual example of one, the Body of the risen Saviour; and—here is the point at which we are aiming—the resurrection of the spiritual *body* is used to establish the fact that the last Adam became a quickening *Spirit*: 'There is a spiritual *body*: even so (*οὕτως καί*) hath it been written, the last Adam became a quickening *Spirit*.' Now let the words of our Saviour at Capernaum be read in the light of this passage, and of the light which is thrown by this passage on the history of His Own Resurrection. He reproved the doubts of His disciples as to how they were to feed on His Flesh, by referring on to a time when He should have ascended: 'Doth this offend you? what then if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?' And He tells them in connexion with this that 'the spirit is that which quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.' He leads them on, in other words, from the thought of what He was then, to the thought of what He was to become, when He should have risen and ascended into heaven; from a state of things in which He was man among men, to a state of things in which, still being Man, He should no longer be among men but *within* them, by the power of the Indwelling Spirit poured out upon the mystical Body. If we remember that His Body in its present state is no longer a psychic body such as the bodies that we know upon earth, but is, and was manifested as, the Spiritual Body of the Resurrection, then there is absolutely nothing in the words to exclude a direct reference to the Eucharist from being the pervading thought of the whole discourse. 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth,' indeed, but then we are expressly taught by St. Paul that there is a spiritual body, and that, *therefore*, because of that spiritual Body the last Adam became a quickening Spirit. 'The flesh,' indeed, 'profiteth nothing,' but St. Paul draws a direct antithesis between bodies of flesh and blood such as are incapable of 'inheriting incorruption,' and the spiritual body of the resurrection—in virtue, once more, of which 'the last Adam became a quickening Spirit.' 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth,' not in the sense that the present application of redemption must be a process wholly spiritual, although the means by which it was effected were throughout both spiritual and material; not in the sense that the bodies of His redeemed, which He tells us are to be raised at the last day because of the feeding upon Him here, are not capable of being made partakers while on earth of the very Corporeity of their Saviour; but in the sense that were He now what He was then, not quickened in a Spiritual Body, the feeding of which He spoke were as impossible as it appeared to the Capharnaïtes.

'The flesh profiteth nothing,' not in the sense that the Holy Body of the Redeemer is not in its glorified condition the channel of all spiritual blessings to the faithful, individually and collectively; for then, how could we resist the inevitable conclusion that the offering of the same Body on the Cross profiteth nothing for the salvation of our race? But the flesh profiteth nothing in the sense that even the sacrifice of that Body had availed nothing for our redemption unto God, apart from that unction of the Spirit by which now it hath been finally glorified.

'Holy Spirit was not as yet' in the days of His Presence upon earth, 'because that Jesus was not yet glorified.' The great gift could not accrue to the Church; nay, the Church as His Spiritual Body could not even be called into existence until the 'Holy Thing' which was born for our sakes, and which was offered to redeem us from evil, should have passed out of its state of humiliation and been exalted to the glorious condition in which it is the Example and the Archetype of the spiritual bodies of the great hereafter.

It is only by ignoring all this, by forgetting the great forty days, by shutting our eyes to the teaching of St. Paul about the future of our own poor humanity, that we can evacuate the sixth chapter of St. John of a reference to the Sacrament of the Eucharist as direct as words can make it. If our conceptions of the resurrection of the body include nothing but a mere resuscitation, if we take Lazarus and not Jesus Christ as our instance of what is meant by Resurrection, then only shall we say like the disciples, 'hard is the saying; who can hear it?' If we recognize, after the teaching of St. Paul, that what is sown a natural body is raised a spiritual body, we shall impose no material limitations on the possibilities of the glorified Humanity. It was offered on the Cross for our sins, it was raised for our justification, it ascended that by its own final unction the Pentecostal effusion might be secured. Surely, then, by spiritual sacramental participation of it will our redemption be brought about in this world, as we believe that through its instrumentality our resurrection is to be brought about in the last day. Surely, in a word, we may say with St. Leo, 'Ut accipientes virtutem cœlestis cibi, in carnem ipsius qui caro noster factus est, transeamus' (*Ep.* 59. 2).

It remains to apply what we have just said to the words of Institution themselves. The words are plain enough. The absence of a predicative copula in the dialect used by our Lord does not make an iota of difference to the directness of

the statement which He made. He said in the hearing of His disciples, of things which were present to their senses, 'This is My Body'; 'This cup is the new covenant in My Blood.' Even if we knew nothing of the present conditions under which His Body exists, we should not be justified in explaining His words so as to rob them of their literal signification; but still the strain upon our faith would have been quite indefinitely increased, had it been unrelieved by any special assurance that He was carrying us into a region of things to which experience provides us with no parallel.

As it is, the object of our faith as we bow before the mystery of the Eucharist is a Body of whose present conditions we are wholly incapable of reasoning, but of which we know from recorded facts that it does not recognize the limitations which we associate with the bodies of earth; that it is the archetype, as it shall be the efficient, of the 'change' which shall pass over other bodies when they too 'inherit incorruption.'

We maintain, then, to sum up what we have said upon the second great Sacrament of the Gospel, that the truth of the Real Presence in the Eucharist runs on absolutely parallel lines with unquestioned dogmas of the faith. We maintain that Christ's words at Capernaum, 'the spirit is that which quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing,' do not make against the literal acceptance of the words which He spoke at the Supper table; that they but carry us into that spiritual region of the risen and glorified Humanity in which alone the words of Institution were capable of being literally fulfilled. And we maintain that by proving all this, we have established for the second great Sacrament what we established above for the first. The literalness of the words of Institution need offer no stumbling-block to faith unless we arbitrarily isolate their consideration from everything revealed to us elsewhere which falls naturally into parallelism with them. If we read them in their natural context, we find that they belong to a region where the true antithesis to 'spiritual' is not 'real' but 'animal' or 'psychic.' And the very words of our Lord at Capernaum so often quoted to prove the Presence metaphorical, are exactly what raise the whole context into the atmosphere of the spiritual world to which, as we learn from St. Paul, the Ascended Body belongs; a world in which the spiritual *is* the real even where the body, there 'changed,' is concerned.

To reduce the great Sacrament of the Eucharist to what was called on a memorable occasion 'a barren symbol of an absent Christ,' is, then, to do violence to the faith in the proportions in which Scripture presents it to us. Then only is

our  
of  
bod  
He

dea  
'sp  
wo  
wh  
Bo  
the  
fut  
not  
Pa  
Go  
sha  
pos  
tha  
tha  
spi  
fai  
'bl  
pat  
tion  
stor  
loc  
Bo  
not  
exp  
dor  
ship  
rem  
the  
the  
qui

we  
pre  
of  
emp  
dep  
and  
up  
spir  
mac

our faith in the Eucharist made analogous to the whole body of revelation when we treat it as an 'effectual sign' uniting us body and soul to Him who became Man for our sakes, that He might redeem us in both parts of our complex nature.

Just to glance for a moment at what would follow if in dealing with the Body of the Resurrection we could admit that 'spiritual' and 'real' could ever be mutually exclusive. We would ask can it be supposed for a moment that the Body which was handled by the Apostles was any the less a 'real' Body because it was exempt from the limitations which beset the gross bodies of earth? Can it be supposed that our own future bodies with which we are to be clothed to eternity are not to be regarded as 'real' bodies because we are told by St. Paul that ['flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God,' but that] 'we shall be changed' in the Resurrection, and shall rise with 'spiritual bodies'? And yet if these are impossible suppositions, then how can it be logically maintained that the Presence in the Eucharist is not 'real,' on the ground that it is vouchsafed to the faithful 'after an heavenly and spiritual manner'? That the participation of Christ by the faithful cannot be a carnal participation, we maintain with the 'black rubric' of the Church of England. But that participation after a spiritual manner is any the less a real participation; that the Body which passed from the tomb when the stone was still lying on its opening is incapable of being locally connected with the Bread which He declares is His Body; that the great crowning Sacrament of the Gospel is nothing but an acted parable, a dramatizing of a figurative expression; that no reverence, nay, that no adoration is to be done to Christ there Present, as distinguished from the worship of the elements—all this we are forbidden to affirm if we remember one simple truth, that 'if there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body,' and that, 'in like manner' to the existence of the spiritual body, 'the last Adam became a quickening spirit.'

Still more cogently will this argument be brought home if we place in the parallelism which belongs to them the expressions of our Saviour at Capernaum about the connexion of the Eucharist with the Resurrection, and the expressions employed by St. Paul to show how our own resurrection is dependent on that of our Lord: 'Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day:.' 'If there is a natural body there is also a spiritual body, and so it is written the first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening



Spirit.' And here we must draw to a conclusion, just placing what we have said about the Eucharist in connexion with the thesis with which we started.

We laid down that the sadly common prejudice against the direct reality of the Sacraments as means of grace was to be traced to a point farther back than that failure to apprehend the Incarnation to which it is so obvious to attribute it; indeed, that the failure to apprehend the Incarnation was to be traced to a more primary blank in the theological apprehension of most Englishmen, the failure to apprehend the importance which belongs to the body itself in the primary intention of the Creator and in His scheme for the redemption of fallen man.

Having demonstrated the place of the body in the dealings of God with the human race alike in creation and in redemption, we then showed that the analogy of the faith disproved the puritan assumption that Christ's work must be applied to individuals by processes wholly spiritual, an assumption which underlay and accounted for the inability to look upon the Sacraments as anything but metaphorical conceptions embodied in symbolical acts.

We next applied to the two 'Sacraments of the Gospel' what had been established by more general arguments about the principle of Sacraments generally. We showed that it was not only to be expected that the work wrought out by our Lord under conditions which are on one side material should be applied to individual Christians by means not exclusively spiritual, but that the Sacraments as we actually possess them run on lines most strictly parallel to the needs which they are intended to supply, and that about the needs, as distinguished from the supply, all orthodox Evangelical Christians are entirely at one with us Catholics. And we have proved of the Real Presence in particular, that it exhibits the exactest of parallels to what we know of the present conditions under which the Lord's Body subsists, and with all that we know from Revelation of the future bodies of the saints.

The habits of thought of a theological school are not things to be revised at short notice. And we doubt not that the arguments here adduced will be submitted to the ordinary process so engrained into the minds of us all, which takes for granted that if a position is untenable we are excused from detailed consideration of the points which can be adduced in its favour. But signs have not been wanting of late that on the fringe of each great party there are those whose theological prepossessions are liable to a good deal of modification

by  
cess  
argu  
been  
Scri  
no i  
up o  
pari  
sage  
and  
crea

thin  
aspe  
pari  
abor  
whol  
hous

*The*

WE  
aspe  
have  
to m  
lecti  
inqu  
For,  
notic  
satis  
wher  
unaff  
show  
Evol  
that,  
by a



by arguments from Scripture as a whole. The whole processes have happily become obsolete which reduced theological argument to counter-quotations of pet texts. Our thesis has been maintained from first to last by arguments exclusively Scriptural, and those arguments are founded, as we claim, upon no isolation of those passages which might be found to bolster up our own thesis. They are based upon an elaborate comparison, we dare not say an exhaustive one, of the great passages throughout the whole Bible which set forth the purposes and the methods of the dealings of Almighty God with His creature man.

It may prove that on a future occasion we shall have something to add upon the same subject, not simply in its Scriptural aspects, but also in the light that falls upon it from a comparison of God's working in nature from that which is revealed about His Grace. Meanwhile we recommend it to all thinkers who desire to treat Scripture as a system and not as a storehouse of apt quotations.

---

#### ART. II.—CHARLES DARWIN.

*The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin, including an Autobiographical Chapter.* Edited by his Son, FRANCIS DARWIN. In Three Vols. (London, 1887.)

WE have dealt in former numbers of this Review with various aspects of the great doctrine of Evolution. In truth it would have been difficult to avoid it except by confining ourselves to methods and principles which belong to the past, and neglecting the characteristic aspect in which every subject of inquiry or reflection presents itself to the mind of our time. For, whether it be nature or human history that lies under the notice of man in these days, the knowledge of facts does not satisfy him until they fall into a natural sequence, and tell whence they come and whither they tend. Nor is theology unaffected by the mental habits which are prevalent. It must show that it is consistent as a doctrine with the great fact of Evolution which dominates the known system of things, and that, when considered as itself a fact in human history, it arose, by a necessary development, from causes already in operation.

But the doctrine of Evolution in itself is not our present

subject. The biographer of Darwin has kept strictly to his proper task, and teaches us to consider the great doctrine with which his name is identified only in connexion with his life. He shows us what manner of man it was who propounded this mighty thought, how he laboured at it and worked it out, and how it was received by his fellow-men and affected his outward life and position among them, and, lastly, how it reacted upon his own mental character. And though under this latter head—to us the most interesting of all—there are many questions on which we long in vain to have the great man's thoughts, yet this silence itself is instructive. We have reason to suppose that he knew no more than he tells us, and himself stopped short in thinking where he no longer informs us of his ideas.

The lives of intellectual explorers and discoverers have ever been among the most cherished possessions of literature. We are not satisfied to see the revelations which so change our life hang in the sky to be read like a language of the distant stars. We want the history of their evolution and to know how they made their appearance in the world; we desire to go over the process of their discovery in company, as it were, with the minds which were first led to behold them, and to learn what effect the wondrous vision had upon the eyes on which they burst. But there never was any discovery—none, at all events, in the regions of science—which inspires so great a longing to know its author as Evolution; for there never was any which touched human life so closely. Gravitation affects only the body, but Evolution has to do, not only with the body, but with the mind and with the soul: every belief, every affection of man, whether in the sphere which we call natural or that which we call supernatural, is touched by a doctrine upon the origins of life. Nor has this width of range been unrecognized by the intellectual fathers of the theory. They fought, indeed, vehemently and very justly against the introduction of moral or metaphysical or religious considerations into a scientific inquiry which must depend upon the evidence of facts. But they never denied that the inquiry had the most important bearing upon all the three. And the life of the greatest advocate of the new doctrine affords us the opportunity of observing its practical relations to these all-important departments of conduct and thought. Darwin's books are science, and we are warned against bringing any considerations to bear on them which are not purely scientific. But his life is human, and the record of it enables us to see where and how science touches the living man; where its

evic  
life.

ima  
it th  
selv  
simp  
upon  
and  
bent  
this  
The  
noti  
of w  
work  
him  
heal  
man  
pleas  
him  
indee  
a tow  
we a  
order  
for w  
strong  
stimu  
tively  
forme  
long  
risen  
it wit  
the m  
and a  
sion  
afford  
that o  
nesse  
Paul's  
therei  
jealou  
differ  
world,  
some  
hard i

VOL

evidence suffices and where it is imperfect for the ends of life.

The most ardent disciple of Evolution could not have imagined a founder for his school better fitted to recommend it than was Charles Darwin. Those who cannot class themselves as the disciples of any philosophical school, but are simply men trying to be true and good, will find his example upon the common grounds of humanity singularly attractive and edifying. What is more, it is impossible for any Christian bent on ruling himself after the precepts of his Lord to read this biography without finding both reproof and guidance. The persistent devotion of the man to his work uplifts our notion of what is possible for human nature. The possession of wealth, which serves with many men capable of useful work as a sufficient reason for a life of enjoyment, only gave him the opportunity of devoting himself to labour. Bad health, which, when accompanied with a competence, sends many a vowed priest to saunter and to bewail himself upon the pleasant shores of the Riviera, only served to impose upon him a wise husbandry of his powers. Three hours a day are indeed a short working time in comparison to the labours of a town priest. Yet, when we consider what was done in them, we are taught a lesson of quiet persistence, of system and order, and of self-restraint exercised even upon the passion for work, which is more useful than the unlimited labour of a strong man. The work was done not merely under the stimulus of fame and success; for these came at a comparatively late period, and long after the habits of the life had been formed. It went on as regularly and as patiently for many a long year before, and that even before the great theory had risen upon his imagination to stimulate his study and furnish it with an engrossing object. No less worthy of respect are the moral qualities than the intellectual. Most people know, and all ought to know, the splendid example of self-suppression which the first publication of the Evolution doctrine afforded on the part of Darwin, and still more, if possible, on that of Wallace. It far passes that which has been often witnessed in excellent Christians, and takes its place beside St. Paul's 'notwithstanding, every way Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.' This absence of jealousy is the more striking because Darwin was not indifferent to fame: at least when conferred by the scientific world, which was the great world to him. Of course he had some severe criticisms to face; neither numerous, indeed, nor hard in comparison with what the leaders of great religious

movements have to bear, and softened to him by the enthusiastic support of the friends whose opinion he valued most. But doubtless critical censures were troublesome to a man of weak health and recluse habits. Such as they were, he bore them with perfect dignity. And to our mind the tone of Professor Huxley's contribution to the memoir (though it displays extraordinary ability) is out of harmony with the gentleness of Darwin's own references to the opponents of his doctrine. 'The bad language of sanctimonious scolds' is an expression which forms an absolute blot and disfigurement on such a book as this; and more so when it refers to an article by Bishop Wilberforce of an ability recognized by Darwin himself, and which drew from him not a word of complaint. Does Professor Huxley really think it reasonable to expect that a system capable of fatal applications both to morals and religion, and whose advocates have never to this day clearly shown how such applications are to be avoided, should be accepted by moral teachers with the scientific calmness of those whose sphere is the laboratory, and whom practical consequences do not concern? At least if he demands that we should accept with passionless serenity facts the most surprising to our preconceptions, he ought to show us the way by regarding the excitements of feeling displayed by his opponents as automatic reactions which science should observe and register, but not resent. However, the language which the Professor thinks becoming in reference to authors now sleeping with the subject of their strictures in the grave, brings out by contrast the sweetness of temper which Darwin himself displayed in the very heat of the battle.

The sincerest religious convictions have often proved an insufficient security against vanity; 'What hast thou that thou didst not receive?' is a truism of which the apostle found it necessary to remind the Christians of his time, and which many good people since then appear to have forgotten. But Darwin's estimate of his powers is so modest that, when we have been reading them, we find it necessary to take down one of his books and mark its wonderful power in order to remind ourselves that he was not quite an ordinary person. We shall not, indeed, pay him so poor a compliment as to think that his admission of intellectual defects was either feigned or mistaken. But the perception and confession of deficiencies side by side with the exercise of powers the most magnificent is a spectacle which does a man good to contemplate. Indeed, he was the most honest of men, and the biography is in this point thoroughly worthy of him. It compares well in its

absolute openness with many a Catholic life in which miracles are related for edification of which the proof is all too slight, and with many a Protestant one in which for the same reason moods and feelings are exaggerated and failings suppressed. We feel the most perfect confidence that in this book nothing is omitted as telling against the subject of the story, either in what he writes of himself or in what is written of him. All is open and transparent as day.

This we freely and thankfully concede. But, on the other hand, we will ask Darwin's admirers to allow that absolute honesty is a simpler and easier attainment when the range of thought and feeling is so simple and so earthly as that in which Darwin moved, and to which his biographer may restrict himself. There is here very little concerning those difficult questions, moral and spiritual, which we meet in the religious life: little concerning those relations to things unseen and undefined on which it is so easy to say too much or too little, so hard to record exactly what is felt and done. There are a few select lives, chiefly to be found in the Bible, in which the higher regions of spiritual effort and emotion are entered, and yet as absolute truthfulness preserved as that which meets us in this more earthly record. To the latter belongs the praise of perfect sincerity; but it leaves untouched a whole world of thought which the best minds of the past have ever conceived to belong to them, and with which it is very certain the minds of the future will not cease to deal.

But to complete our picture of Darwin we have to add the simplicity and affection of his domestic life; the warmth of his friendships, leading him sometimes to a lavishness of commendation which his living correspondents must find embarrassing to publish, but still charming, as coming from so great a man; and lastly the good manners and charity which his biographer justly notes as displayed both in his books towards the unknown public and in personal letters to his correspondents. We cannot wonder at the affection with which even those who were strangers to his person regard such a man and such a life; nor that he was buried amid a national mourning in the sepulchre of the kings of our mental and moral life, and in the temple which represents our highest national aspiration and belief. And yet in the faith which founded the temple where he rests, and which the nation that lamented him professes, Darwin did not share. That faith is founded on a Revelation, and Darwin has declared that he believed in none. It rests on the belief that we can know our Father. To Darwin the safest conclusion

seemed to be, that the whole subject of faith in God was beyond the scope of man's intellect (i. 307). And surely to Christian teachers such a declaration is most noteworthy, when it comes from a great leader of the thought of our times, from a man whom our whole nation regards with respect and affection, and in whom we ourselves are thankful to recognize so much virtue and so much power. Where do we stand? Has the nation lost its faith? Do we ourselves believe that Christianity may be dispensed with and no harm or loss ensue?

It would be a great help to us in considering this question if we had some authoritative statement of the relation which the great scientific doctrine that dominated and characterized Darwin's mind bears to religion; and we seem to have such a statement in the chapter which Professor Huxley contributes to the *Life* of his friend.

'It is necessary to remember that there is a wider Teleology which is not touched by the doctrine of Evolution, but is actually based upon the fundamental proposition of Evolution. This proposition is, that the whole world living and not living is the result of the mutual interaction according to definite laws of the forces possessed by the molecules of which the primitive nebulousness of the universe was composed. If this be true, it is no less certain that the existing world lay potentially in the cosmic vapour, and that a sufficient intelligence could from a knowledge of the properties of the molecules of that vapour have predicted, say, the state of the fauna of Britain in 1869 with as much certainty as we can say what will happen to the vapour of the breath on a cold winter's day. . . .

'The teleological and the mechanical views of nature are not, necessarily, mutually exclusive. On the contrary, the more purely a mechanist the speculator is, the more firmly does he assume a primordial molecular arrangement of which all the phenomena of the universe are the consequences, and the more completely is he thereby at the mercy of the teleologist, who can always defy him to disprove that this primordial molecular arrangement was intended to evolve the phenomena of the universe' (ii. 202).

These paragraphs bring the whole subject before us. For teleology implies God. Where an end is aimed at there must be a Mind to conceive the end, and a Power to compass it. And if God's ends can be known, that in itself involves a knowledge of Him: a knowledge of Him as causing events to serve His purposes, and making it known to us that He does so. And this is Revelation.

Our primary object in quoting this remarkable passage is not controversial. But so much of criticism we must offer as to ask whether there is just reason to believe that an intelli-



gence the most sufficient would have been able from a knowledge of the properties of the primitive molecules to predict the present condition of the minds and wills of the people of Britain with the same certainty as it could have foretold the present state of British fauna. A difficult question indeed, which Professor Huxley does not raise, and which we shall not pursue.

And we must also raise a question upon the application of the term mechanical to the system of things. The word mechanical, like the word automatic, is one invented by men to express the absence in some kinds of motion which they see going on around them of certain qualities which they know to belong to the motions which they themselves cause—those of will and choice. But the application of the term is made strictly from a human point of view: it is altogether anthropomorphic. And when we are considering or supposing a power from which all things originate; which gives birth, with no assistance external to itself, to molecules having qualities which implicitly contain the whole future development of the universe, including those powers of the human mind which stand opposed to the word mechanical, it would seem plain that in relation to such a power no movements can be called mechanical. For the first principles of those human constructions to which we apply the term are here wanting: namely, the employment by the constructor of materials and of forces outside himself, by means of which he puts together a form of motion which has none of his own human qualities or powers in it. Therefore the mechanical theory of the universe, if the meaning of that phrase be that the system of the universe is in itself mechanical, is plainly wrong, because it is certain that the term mechanical does not describe the relations of the universe to the primary source of power on which its whole constitution depends.

On the other hand, if the phrase 'mechanical theory of the universe' means only that the universe may be made to appear mechanical to us, it can be met by a flat contradiction. For human choice and will are included in the universe, and the word mechanical is expressly framed to exclude human choice and will; we mean choice and will, not in any disputable sense of the words, or with any assumption of freedom attached to them, but as the purest facts of consciousness. Doubtless aspects may be found in which black and white may be shown to be very closely connected and mutually dependent. But, after all, the two words were framed by human beings to express two different appearances, and, to them,

black never can be white. It is quite as sure that choice and will can, to man, never be mechanical. In no way, therefore, can the mechanical theory of things afford anything but an anthropomorphic and imperfect account of nature. And the very same reasoning applies to the word automatic. That word denotes something which moves of itself without being directed by anyone's choice or will. Now, regarding the universe in relation to the primary origin of force, it is quite certain that no movement of any kind can be automatic; for it cannot be independent of that original force, as the automata which men make are independent of human interference.<sup>1</sup> And on the other hand, from man's point of view no movements which imply human choice or will can, by the very meaning of the word, be automatic.

Similar reasoning is very applicable to another phrase which Professor Huxley uses—namely, 'the properties possessed by the molecules' of the primitive vapour. His application of the phrase involves the admission that the molecules at their first appearance have properties which are not self-produced, but conferred by some unknown power behind them. Now, according to our apprehension, the molecules either in their primitive condition or in any subsequent step of evolution, can never be properly said to be 'possessed of properties' which they hold in so entirely derivative a manner. We may use the phrase so long as we regard them from a purely human point of view and compare them with ourselves and our own powers; but it is untrue in relation to the original fountain of all force. No property can belong to anything apart from It.

Mr. Herbert Spencer has been of late discovering that the scientific terms which have been most carefully chosen to exclude anthropomorphism are themselves anthropomorphic. And the admission is abundantly illustrated by the terms which Professor Huxley uses in this passage. We do not complain of the use of such terms, for it is entirely impossible for a human being to use any words which are not adapted to his own nature and limitations. But when science is perforce anthropomorphic it has very little right to condemn religion for being the same. And presentations of nature and life which are human and partial in their very essence have no claim whatever to the dominating position and to the universal sway which their framers so often claim for them. This

<sup>1</sup> Thus in Acts xii. 10, the iron gate opened *αὐτομάτῃ* to Peter. But this automatism in relation to human agency implies no automatism in relation to that of God; but the reverse.

mechanical theory of the universe, these properties of molecules, are the powers that are supposed sufficient to shut God out from us altogether, or to banish Him back into the beginning of things where knowledge and intercourse cannot reach. The phrases have no ideas behind them which are properly capable of any such use.

Thus much we have been led to say concerning Professor Huxley's statement of the scientific aspect of the universe, in itself. But our chief attention is due to the relation which he regards the scientific view as holding to religion. Science, he tells us, is at the mercy of the teleologist when he defies it to disprove the fact that the evolution of the universe was designed.

The question whether intelligence and love are to be discerned in the system of the world is, to those who look higher than the gratification of their earthly wants, the most interesting enquiry that can be raised. And on this absorbing subject Professor Huxley admits that science can of herself return no answer. She must stand aside while other systems advance their assertions and profess herself unable to contradict any of them. It is not a lofty position which is thus claimed for science; nor does it justify the exclusive faith and devotion which so many nowadays offer to her. A power that has nothing to say upon the question of a God can poorly satisfy the soul of man.

But when Professor Huxley represents science as unable to refute the teleologist we may (would it were otherwise) suppose him to imply that while the whole subject of the origin of nature lies beyond the sphere of science, it also, in lying beyond science, lies beyond human knowledge. In that region, he would tell us, there may be guesses, imaginations and hopes, but nothing that can be known. This is agnosticism, to which the admission that teleology cannot be disproved means only permission given to occupy a position which is in the nature of things inaccessible.

The question whether it be so or not depends upon the question whether the understanding is our only means of attaining truth. Whatever the understanding can grasp is science, and if the understanding be the sole organ whereby truth is attained, then science is the only truth; however unable she may be to refute assertions concerning matters outside her sphere, she will feel perfectly assured that all ascertainable truth belongs to her, while other so-called beliefs must owe their origin to faculties to which truth in the pure sense does not belong.

Now if the understanding be the sole organ of truth it must at once strike us that human nature at large has been through all its history under the completest delusion. For of that which human nature has taken for truth by far the largest part has been reached by the feelings, the affections, the instincts, or, highest of all, the reason, while the understanding has but at the most served as a restraint or a guide in the exercise of the faculties which really give the impulse to life. What is more, the same thing is true of the illimitable mass of life which Evolution displays to us working, striving, and changing; under what impulse? Certainly not that of science, nor of the understanding, which is the agent of science. And even in science itself there is needed for the attainment of truth something which the understanding does not furnish: the idea of causation, the conception of uniformity, the grouping and classing of phenomena, and the deduction of general conceptions. All these depend upon the exertion of faculties beyond and above that observation of sensible facts and their sequences which is the function of the understanding. Although the value and the loftiness of science depend upon causation, uniformity and general laws, yet none of these are capable of scientific proof: in all of them an instinct of the reason outruns the understanding. Although, therefore, it may be well required that the understanding shall be allowed to exercise its duty of criticism and restraint in a higher degree as the mental evolution of man proceeds, yet the demand that it shall be regarded as the sole organ for the attainment of truth is too utter a reversal of the immemorial traditions of animate nature to be accepted as possible. A being seeking the knowledge of external truth by means of the understanding alone would no longer be man.

When, therefore, science confesses its inability to disprove the conception of a personal providence ruling life, it has no right to assume at the same time that where it steps aside there is no other faculty capable of filling the vacant place and assuring man upon principles which are valid in every part of his life of the existence of a God, the source of his being, and the guide of his soul. The prevalence of religion bears testimony to the confidence with which man has accepted the assurance, and science has but a right to demand that it should be allowed to watch the exercise of these religious faculties in man and restrain them from mistake and excess; but not that it should supersede them. Such, indeed, is its office towards the exercise of knowledge and affection even between man and man—an office of correction which

inf  
the  
sci  
but  
wh

sib  
req  
Hu  
life  
ativ  
acti  
Hin  
mor  
scie  
thos  
mor  
sligh

if a  
bec  
lect  
in a  
to a  
the  
whic  
poss  
A b  
occu  
may  
is a  
gian  
poor  
able  
it sh  
out i  
frien  
cons  
love  
affect  
trem  
man.  
men,  
Men  
peopl

inflicts a fatal injury if it goes on to deny the validity of the faculty it is appointed to guard. We demand from science, not alone the admission that it cannot disprove a God, but also the recognition of powers which may reach to that which it admits as possible, but cannot itself attain.

And if science must admit the knowledge of God as possible, it is unreasonable that this mighty truth should be required to retain the purely negative position which Professor Huxley's words assign to it. The existence of a Father of life ought not to be left by any of His children a mere inoperative speculation dwelling afar from those thoughts and actions of life, every one of which is directly connected with Him. He is not far from any of us; for in Him we live and move and have our being. The same reasons which compel science to admit Him as a possibility justify the position of those who regard Him as a positive truth of immeasurable moment, a truth in comparison of which all other truth is of slight importance.

Nor should science have anything but approval to express if a further step still be taken, and the existence of God become, not only a positive conviction accepted by the intellect, though not the work of the intellect, and taking its part in all our conceptions of life and history, but also an incentive to action and a subject of emotion. It is well known that the adoption of a belief by the emotions is a further step which is not always taken by those to whom the belief is a possibility, or even by those to whom it is a positive persuasion. A belief, in Paley's phrase, may remain otiose. Even the occupation of the mind with the evidence of its certainty may be an impediment to its active and emotional use. This is a commonplace in religious experience. Learned theologians and zealous disputers on the points of faith may be very poor practical Christians. But the defect is highly unreasonable. Everyone will admit that when the mind holds a belief it should surround it with the proper affections, and follow it out into the proper consequences in action. If a man has a friend of whose amiable qualities he is firmly persuaded, we consider him very blameworthy if he does not render the love which he knows to be deserved. Yet this failure of the affection to follow out the persuasions of the mind is an extremely common experience in the intercourse of man with man. Very clever and intellectual men, and even very virtuous men, are sometimes found to display a deadness of the heart. Men of science of the proper stamp agree with all other good people in regarding those whose beliefs concerning the cha-

racter of their friends remain cold intellectual theories as exceedingly defective, unreasonable in the deepest sense, instead of being what they perhaps consider themselves, examples of proper self-restraint and moderation.

And in like manner it ought to be agreeable to that sense of the fitness of things which true science professes when men before whose minds the thought of God has risen even as a great possibility, and much more as a positive truth, ponder upon the mighty theme with every feeling of awe, hope, and love, give themselves to its propagation, and sacrifice for its sake whatever the flesh holds dear. Even superstition is, as we may say, less unscientific in a believer than apathy; just as everyone would allow that excessive blandishments towards a wife would be a slighter sin against the laws of nature than coldness and neglect. But there need be neither superstition nor error. We claim that the utmost enthusiasm and earnestness of believers in God is justified by Professor Huxley's admission of the inability of science to contradict their faith. He speaks of Evolution as claimant to the throne of the world of thought. But to our minds no theory of the method after which things have come to be as they are can ever be king of our thought. The title belongs to the Power which has worked by that method, not to the method. The original source of the law, not the law itself, has a right to the title of king. If God made men, He is king of their thought, however He chose to make them. If Matter made men, then it is king, and let them put their trust in its shadow if they can.

At all events, upon Professor Huxley's showing, science and teleology—that is to say, science and God—have both standing ground within the mind of man. They are not, properly speaking, enemies; it is possible to give the one that which belongs to it without withdrawing everything from the other. How comes it, then, that they so often have antagonistic tendencies? Why do religious men so often hate science, and scientific men, like the illustrious Darwin, lose their hold upon religion? It is, we believe, an affair of habit, like the lawyer's devotion to law and the soldier's to war. Whenever two capacities exist in man's mind or body, the one may be developed and the other suffer atrophy. The lawyer's ignorance of military affairs, and the contempt and neglect which he extends to them, do not prove their unimportance in general, nor even their unimportance to him. They only prove that the powers of the mind are narrow, and that exclusive devotion to one subject places it in an unfavourable attitude for taking due



account of another. This happens to the ablest men as easily as to the dullest; one might say, more easily. For ability consists in power of attention to a subject, and is generally rewarded by a success which stimulates the devotion, and renders it more exclusive. It is the ablest lawyers that are the most perfectly alienated from matters of war. Nor is it often that men are sufficiently wise not to despise that which lies beyond their own chosen knowledge, as pretending to perform an office which is better filled by it. The lawyer regards his law, and the soldier his sword, as the best final arbiter of disputes.

We perfectly allow that this exaggeration of what one has paid attention to has been extremely common with religious men; but the scientific are busy in following their example. And religious men prove as capable of admitting and assimilating the facts of science as scientific men those of religion. We had almost said, more capable. Professor Huxley finishes his chapter by a gibe at the 'happy ingenuity' which will perhaps 'discover that the new wine is exactly of the same vintage as the old, and that, rightly viewed, the old bottles prove to have been expressly made for holding it.' It angers him that the old bottles will not break. He is quite safe against retort. We should be only too happy if he could discover that his own bottles of the newest pattern will hold the good wine of religion. And it seems to us that in the passage we have quoted he has gone much further towards saying that they do so than many of his scientific peers would approve.

There is an element in the doctrine of Evolution which is of undefined character and extent, and may to the mind in which it lodges be either a vanishing point or an ever-present reality. We mean the unknown Power which communicates the impulse to the mighty mass. There are evolutionists to whom this originating power is a something which is a mere nothing—out of sight and out of mind—lost in the immeasurable past; there are others for whom it is the largest part of every phenomenon: the only efficient cause: whose methods of working the story of evolution describes, but cannot comprehend or explain. And what is it that decides the proportion which this unknowable element is to assume in practical life and thought? Not, as we believe, intellectual processes for which there is equal room on either side, but moral and spiritual tendencies, both inherited and acquired, habit and choice, such as operate in all our life, mental and physical. And we find this theory perfectly well exemplified in the life of Charles Darwin.

His father was a free thinker.<sup>1</sup> He was brought up at a Unitarian school.<sup>2</sup> He was certainly not without religious impulses in early life. Henslow could speak to him of his deep religious convictions, and it is plain that Darwin's mind responded with great sympathy to these confidences (i. 188). Although he despises heartily, and perhaps justly, the opinions of theologians upon matters distinctly scientific, yet we believe it was not from the hope of deliverance from the annoyance of religious clamour, that he rejoiced so frankly in the adhesion of men like Kingsley. He is emphatic in his declaration that the missionaries are good men working in a good cause (i. 264). But what strikes us more than occasional declarations of opinion is his habitual use of the name of God—'Thank God;' 'God bless you;' 'God forgive me;' 'I hope to God;' 'I wish to God.'<sup>3</sup> There are many religious biographies in which such expressions are not so abundant as in this *Life* of a professed unbeliever. They do not occur merely in his earlier years, but throughout the whole, and the most affecting of them all concludes his last published letter; the last recorded word to his illustrious friend, Professor Huxley: 'I wish to God there were more automata in the world like you.' It seems, to our ears, as if the expression denoted the contradiction between the mechanical theory and the human heart. Doubtless these appeals to God will seem to many to bear the character of mere expletives, to which overmuch meaning is not to be ascribed. But we do not think it. We believe they indicate the want and desire of this great soul. We do not hold that those pay the highest respect to his memory who consider that when he says 'God bless you' he at the same time doubts if there be a God able or willing to hear the aspiration, or to give the blessing. And yet in order to believe that there is such a Being, or such room for His blessing, the writer must for the moment have ceased to be an agnostic.

Many of his declarations of disbelief are hesitating. He doubts and yet seems to doubt whether he ought to doubt. His judgment fluctuates: he has not thought deeply enough upon the subject (i. 305). It comes over him sometimes with overwhelming force that the wonderful contrivances of nature are the expression of Mind; but at other times it seems to go away (i. 316). It is true that there are expressions of disbelief

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, vol. iii. p. 179.

<sup>2</sup> i. 27.

<sup>3</sup> 'Thank God,' i. 133, 269, 331; ii. 126, 145, 165. 'God forgive me,' i. 150. 'God bless you,' i. 234, 240, 262, 271, 361. 'I wish to God,' i. 391; ii. 9; iii. 358.

in revelation of a more decided character than these. But it seems to us, and we think was felt by himself, that he had never looked at the positive side of Christianity with attention. The Old Testament is to him on a level with the Vedas, and it is impossible to suppose that God would connect with it a message to mankind: the Gospels cannot be proved to be written by eye-witnesses. But the wondrous spiritual character of the Old Testament, the divine consistency of the picture of the life of Jesus do not seem to strike him as any argument for belief. There were no painful struggles in the surrender of belief. It faded away.

And the cause of the loss is not difficult to find; there is no attempt on the part either of the great man or his biographer to conceal it. To begin with, Darwin seems never to have experienced the deeper feelings of religion. The prayers which he records are boyish invocations for success in races; he seems to know no meaning for conscience except the sense of failure in social proprieties; he is aware that the religious sentiment was never strongly developed in him, and gives no instance of its work in him of a more spiritual character than that experienced in a Brazilian forest, 'not essentially differing from the sense of sublimity' (i. 311). But of that sense of sin, of that thirst of the soul for God, which so many of the loftiest human souls have experienced, he seems with all his excellence to have known nothing.

He acknowledges himself a bad metaphysician (i. 69). If this merely meant a defect of ingenuity in spinning theories apart from facts, it would be a gain rather than a loss. But if it means a tendency to live in the outward world rather than the inward, and to observe external facts rather than internal, it is a grievous want indeed. For all external or historical facts can but furnish the conditions by which the mental life of man is limited; the great question is as to the nature of the mental life itself.

Side by side with these circumscribed spiritual wants and faculties, Darwin possessed the most magnificent powers of concentrated observation and imagination in the outer world; the exercise of them delighted and engrossed him and encouraged him by their fruitful results. And so he himself describes his mind as having become a kind of machine for grinding general laws out of large collections of facts. He lost his pleasure in poetry and music and painting; he came, in his own words, not to be able to 'endure to read a line of poetry' (i. 101), and in his candid way he bewails the loss as injurious both intellectually and morally. He declares that

his present want of perception of spiritual things is not of the least value as evidence (i. 312). He does not claim to have discovered any secrets by which the falsehood of revelation is proved; nor does he take the tone of superior information which so many scientists of lower rank adopt in dealing with the adherents of religion.

In one particular alone does he think that the habits of a scientific man are of advantage in judging of Christianity—he is cautious in admitting evidence; save for this, ‘Science has nothing to do with Christ.’ And we may be allowed to doubt whether even this exception can be allowed and whether the proper evidence of revelation is so like that of scientific phenomena that habits of critical judgment in the latter sphere are the best preparation for the former. To us it seems that revelation is expressly a message to active human life, and that its evidence is parallel to that upon which we act in life, not to that which we demand in science. Darwin’s mental habits unfitted him for judging of the evidence that Shakespeare was a poet, or that poetry is worthy of man’s attention. Why should it be taken for granted that they gave him an advantage over ordinary mortals in judging of the evidence that Christianity is a revelation?

Evolution itself does not teach us that grubbing at the roots of man’s bodily and mental life is the best way of learning what that life needs and in what it results. Has all this mighty history led up to the production of minds which are not to be partakers of the general tradition, but judges of it, and whose estimate of what we are is to be constantly biased by the supposed knowledge whence we came. ‘Can the mind of man,’ asks Darwin, ‘which has, as I fully believe, been developed from a mind as low as that possessed by the lowest animals, be trusted when it draws such grand conclusions?’ (i. 313). But to our thinking this limitation of the powers of man’s soul and mind by the previous stages of his evolution requires us to confound Evolution with Creation. Why should not man’s mind, though developed from that of an ascidian, reach the grand conclusion of the existence of God if God impressed upon the beginning of Evolution its destined result? And it is plain enough that if we are to judge what our minds are equal to, by their ancestry, moral life and even intellectual will be shorn of their highest meaning and application just as much as spiritual. Why should the Theory of Development be more accessible to the descendant of a starfish than the Being of God?

We have a firm belief—let the readers of these volumes

judge if we are wrong—that there was room enough in Darwin's mind as well as in his theory for enthusiastic religion if only the habits of his life had been different and his faculties had been cultivated in different proportions from that which was actually the case. Whatever thoughts they were which made him use the name of God as of a present and beneficent power, they might as certainly have grown to fill a larger space in his mind than they did, as a little plant smothered and kept down by a larger would grow if some one would give it air and room.

What the results of his religious defects were to him it is not man's province to judge. To his own Master he standeth or falleth. But surely it would be impossible to believe that such a soul was lost. We claim that, in all reason and upon the principles of his own system, the virtues of his life must be in part attributed to the traditions of the Christian society amidst which he lived; and the same argument requires us to allow that Christ may recognize His mark upon this great soul even though the clouds of human infirmity and the shortness of human sight seemed to hide Him from it. That his want of faith (like our probably greater want of it) will cost nothing hereafter we cannot be sure; for it cost him, as it costs us all, much loss here. If he laments his inability to enjoy the highest efforts of poetry and art, it was a still greater deprivation, whether he himself knew it or not, that he should have missed the helps of prayer, the love of the Father bidding us love all things for His sake and in Him, and the sure hope of life and immortality in Christ. But we feel certain that the separation of truthfulness, kindness and self-sacrifice from Him who is the highest source of them all cannot, in this world or the next, be either lasting or complete.

---

## ART. III.—THE NATIONAL GALLERY.

1. *The Abridged Catalogue of the Pictures in the National Gallery, with short Biographical Notices of the Painters. Foreign Schools.* (London, 1887.)
2. *Descriptive and Historical Catalogue of the Pictures in the National Gallery, with Biographical Notices of the Deceased Painters. British and Modern Schools.* (London, 1887.)
3. *Notes on the National Gallery.* By WALTER ARMSTRONG. (London, 1887.)
4. *The National Gallery. The Italian Pre-Raphaelites.* By COSMO MONKHOUSE. (London, 1887.)

FIFTY years ago—in the month of April 1838—the National Gallery was first opened to the public. The foundation of the institution, indeed, goes back to 1824, when Lord Liverpool purchased the Angerstein collection, but it was not until 1838 that the pictures were removed from the rooms of a private house in Pall Mall to the present building in Trafalgar Square.

After all the controversies which have raged over the position of the Gallery, after all the committees which have inquired and reported on this vexed question, all the evidence which has been heard, and all the new plans which have been proposed, the old site has held its own, and the National Gallery keeps its jubilee in the original building first erected by Wilkins, the architect, on the recently-cleared ground near Charing Cross, a spot selected by the Government as 'the finest site in Europe.'

It cannot be said that the edifice was in any way worthy of its position, or well adapted to its purpose, but at least we are all prepared to admit that successive improvements have largely contributed to its usefulness and suitability, while the worst predictions as to the injury likely to be suffered by the pictures themselves have happily failed of fulfilment. The smoke and fog of Charing Cross have not effected that ruin which was declared inevitable, and the use of glass, as well as continual watchfulness on the part of the authorities, has so far successfully resisted the action of the London atmosphere.

Meanwhile, the collection has increased with marvellous rapidity, and has within the last ten years risen into the first rank of European galleries. At the present time the entire Gallery numbers about twelve hundred pictures, of which



four hundred and fifty are by English, and the remainder by foreign artists. And, instead of being the 'European jest,' which Mr. Ruskin termed it forty years ago, the National Gallery is justly the pride and glory of England. In point of size it cannot compare with most of its foreign rivals. Neither can it ever hope to equal them in certain features which form their peculiar boast. The Titians of Madrid and the Rembrandts of the Hermitage, the treasures of Florentine, of Venetian, and Milanese art which belong to the Pitti and the Uffizi, the Academy of Venice and the Brera, can never be excelled. But in point of careful and discriminating selection, as well as in the variety and completeness with which the different schools and periods of art are represented, the National Gallery compares favourably with any of these.

'In the total of its pictures,' says Mr. Armstrong, one of the most recent writers on the subject, 'the National Gallery is about half the size of the museums of Dresden, Madrid, and Paris, the three largest in the world, and considerably less than those of Berlin, Munich, and St. Petersburg. But in quality it is surpassed by none of its rivals. Its standard has been set higher than that of any other collection, and in each of the great foreign galleries there are scores, if not hundreds, of pictures which would not be received in Trafalgar Square' (p. 6).

And Sir George Trevelyan, speaking of the National Gallery a few months ago, pronounced it to be 'the best selected and best cared for collection in the world.' At the same time no gallery in Europe is more easily accessible to the public. In this respect we gratefully acknowledge the increased facilities which have been afforded by the trustees and Director of late years. Not only are the public admitted by payment of sixpence on Thursdays and Fridays, days formerly reserved exclusively for students, but all through the summer months the Gallery does not close till seven, an indulgence greatly appreciated by persons accustomed to be turned out of foreign galleries at three o'clock, by what the painter Millet called that terrible '*On ferme*' of '*les gardiens*.' The authorities of the Louvre, it must in fairness be added, have for several years extended the hours during which their vast collections are open till four in winter and five in summer, and it is a pity their example is not more generally followed, especially in Italy.

A glance at the yearly report presented to Parliament will show how extraordinary has been the increase of visitors to the National Gallery within the last few years. The numbers have of late seldom been less than a million, and in

some years they have exceeded that figure. In fact, the appreciation of the public has kept pace with the rapid development of the Gallery itself, and is to be taken, we hope, as a proof that the nation is worthy of its possession.

Another sign of the great and increasing interest felt in the national collection is the number and excellence of the writings which have been recently devoted to the subject, and more especially to the Italian schools. We have had the learned and valuable treatises of Dr. Gustav Frozzom and Dr. J. E. Richter, and we have had even more lately Mr. Cosmo Monkhouse's admirable little guide to the early Italian masters, and Mr. Armstrong's useful pamphlet, giving both the history of the institution and a description of the foreign schools. The last-named brochure is the more valuable as Mr. Armstrong has taken advantage of the opportunity to point out several interesting points connected with the authorship of pictures, on some of which he has already spoken with the authority of a careful student and acute critic. In the absence of the long-desired new and revised edition of the catalogue which still delays to make its appearance, we can heartily commend this pamphlet to general readers as much as to well-informed students, while the visitor who still feels puzzled in the presence of the earlier masters and seeks to know what he is to admire in them, cannot do better than address himself to Mr. Cosmo Monkhouse's simple but thoughtful and pleasantly-written pages.

The growth of our national collection is the more remarkable when we reflect how modern its origin is compared to that of other great public galleries. Only one of these belongs to the present century. This is the Berlin collection, which, founded in 1815 by the Prussian Government, has been gradually enriched with pictures of different schools from the first, selected and classified in the most admirable manner by a succession of directors, which include names as famous in art history as Von Rumohr, Waagen, Meyer, and Bode. The galleries of Florence, of the Louvre, of Dresden, alike owe their existence to princely founders, who began these superb collections as early as the sixteenth century. The art treasures of the Uffizi and the Pitti were first brought together by the Grand Dukes of the illustrious House of Medici. The Elector Augustus III. and his favourite Count Brühl acquired the masterpieces of Correggio, Titian's 'Tribute Money,' and the Sistine Madonna for the Dresden Gallery; while the Louvre was founded by Francis I. in the best days of the Renaissance, and successively enriched in munificent gifts of

reac  
for c  
eigh  
on t  
Sir  
purch  
of for  
by S  
Adul  
Heat  
pictu  
and a  
were  
Ariad  
'Vier  
numb  
new H  
had h  
shows

the Grand Monarque and the spoils of Napoleon's conquests. Kings and emperors of another august line collected the precious works which to-day adorn the halls of the Prado and the Belvedere, and make these museums the pride of Spain and Austria. And we in England were not without our royal patron and art collector. Charles I., whose taste was as refined as his love of art was genuine, spared no expense in bringing together the choicest paintings by Italian masters, while he had Rubens and Vandyck, the first Flemish artists of the day, in his own service. He bought the famous collection of the Duke of Mantua, which included the cartoons of Raphael and Mantegna, the 'Holy Family,' known as the Pearl, and many of the finest Titians now at Madrid and in the Louvre, and selected forty-six masterpieces by Raphael, Titian, Correggio, and others, to adorn his own rooms at Whitehall. The dispersion of that magnificent collection by public auction was indeed a national calamity, and although Cromwell saved the cartoons of Raphael and Mantegna, and Charles II. rescued as many of his father's pictures as he could lay hands on, most of the great prizes had already gone beyond seas, and were irrecoverably lost to England. It was left to our own generation and the Victorian age to form a new gallery which, if it could not equal its foreign rivals in antiquity, should at least be a worthy monument of the civilization and culture of modern England.

A brief sketch of the steps by which the collection has reached its present importance may not be without interest for our readers. In 1824 Lord Liverpool bought the thirty-eight pictures of the Angerstein collection, acting, it is said, on the suggestion of George IV.; and two years afterwards Sir George Beaumont, who had taken an active part in the purchase, presented sixteen pictures with the express purpose of founding a National Gallery. The great 'Raising of Lazarus,' by Sebastian del Piombo, Rembrandt's 'Woman taken in Adultery,' Hogarth's 'Marriage à la Mode,' Reynolds's 'Lord Heathfield,' and four Claudes were among the Angerstein pictures, for which Parliament granted the sum of 57,000*l.*; and although during the next four years only four pictures were bought, three of these were Titian's 'Bacchus and Ariadne,' Poussin's 'Bacchanalian Dance,' and Correggio's 'Vierge au Panier.' Several bequests had increased the number by 1838, when the pictures were removed to their new home in Trafalgar Square, and, since half the building had been given up to the Royal Academy for its yearly shows, it was soon found that there was only sufficient space

to hang the old masters, which by that time numbered one hundred and ten. Accordingly the Vernon bequest, consisting of 147 works by modern Englishmen, were first hidden away in the 'cellars' or dark rooms on the ground floor of the Gallery, then removed to Marlborough House, and afterwards to South Kensington, where they remained until the year 1876.

The management of the new Gallery had, strange to say, been committed to a board of trustees, of which the First Lord of the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer were always to be members. At the same time a keeper was appointed to take charge of the pictures at a salary of 200*l.* a year. This arrangement could hardly be expected to work well. The trustees, to whom the office of advising the Treasury as to the purchase of pictures had to be assigned, had not the necessary knowledge and training to inspire them with confidence for their task, and naturally many precious opportunities were thrown away and a few serious blunders were made. In 1845 a supposed Holbein, now classed as unknown (195), was palmed off upon them by a French dealer, and a storm of indignation was aroused, to be renewed with fresh violence when, in 1852, the sum of 2,600*l.* was paid for a doubtful Titian, 'The Tribute Money.' A still more serious mistake was made in 1854, when Mr. Gladstone, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, gave 2,800*l.* for the Krüger collection, sixty-four inferior pictures, of which only four have been allowed to remain in the Gallery. A few were sent to the National Gallery of Ireland, and the others were sold at Christie's at about 7*l.* apiece. But by this time a committee of the House of Commons had been appointed to inquire into the management of the institution, and the evidence given by Sir Charles Eastlake, who had been keeper of the Gallery from 1843 till 1847, showed plainly the evils of the old system. In Mr. Armstrong's words:—

'There we see a body of cultivated men giving up their time to the public and eager to do their best for the matters in their charge, but reduced to practical impotence by their want of thorough knowledge and its sequel, confidence, and by their collective responsibility. The chances they let slip were numberless. Reading between the lines, we find that about the year 1848 they might have bought the whole Pitti collection, with its fourteen Raphaels, its sixteen Titians, its Fra Bartolommeos, its Andrea del Sartos, its Rubenses, and the rest. Five years later they might have had the Laurence collection of drawings, by far the finest that was ever made, for 20,000*l.* Sir Charles Eastlake tells the committee how he went to Lord Brougham's with a selection of these in his hand, and found

then  
bee  
n'a  
sen  
col  
the  
ton  
offe  
war  
kind  
in th  
neve  
Euro

limi  
pow  
resp  
Roy  
Wor  
was  
colle  
worl  
time  
The  
exce  
refin  
natio  
prin  
be t  
pain  
espec  
annu  
ten y  
the C  
altar  
tegr  
Seba  
della  
to th  
hardl  
tion.  
Rem  
out t  
for w  
barga  
of the

there Lansdowne and Talleyrand, and how, when the drawings had been looked at, Talleyrand rapped on the table and said, "Si vous n'achetez pas ces choses, vous êtes des barbares," a remark which sent Brougham hot-foot to Lord Grey, who received him with a cold *douche* which put an end to the project. About the same time the unfinished "Michelangelo," since known for years as the "Taunton Madonna," might have been acquired for 500*l.* The trustees offered 250*l.*, which was declined with thanks. Twenty years afterwards it was bought for 2,000*l.* Many more instances of the same kind were given, and it was made clear that unless a radical change in the arrangements for buying were brought about, the Gallery would never take the place wished for it among the great museums of Europe' (p. 4).

The change was made in 1855, when the trustees were limited to six, and a Director appointed armed with sufficient powers both to purchase and arrange pictures on his own responsibility. Sir Charles Eastlake, then president of the Royal Academy, was selected to fill the new post; Mr. Wornum became keeper and secretary, and Mr. Otto Mündler was appointed travelling agent, with the express purpose of collecting information as to foreign collections and sales of works of art. A yearly grant of 10,000*l.* was at the same time promised by Parliament for the purchase of new pictures. The new system worked admirably, and the Gallery has been exceptionally fortunate in its Directors. Sir Charles Eastlake's refined taste and the valuable services which he rendered the nation are known to all. From the first he acted on the principle that the primary object of a public gallery should be the illustration of the different periods and schools of painting in all its branches. With this end in view he paid especial attention to the Italian part of the collection, and his annual journeys to Italy proved rich in results. During his ten years of office as many as 145 pictures were bought for the Gallery, among them such masterpieces as Perugino's altar-piece from the Certosa, the Aldobrandini Raphael, Mantegna's 'Virgin and Saint,' Pollajuolo's 'Martyrdom of St. Sebastian,' and many others by Lippi Botticelli, and Piero della Francesca. His death in 1865 at Pisa was a great blow to the Gallery, and his successor, Sir William Boxall, can hardly be said to have filled the post with as much reputation. He began by throwing away 7,000*l.* on a pretended Rembrandt, 'Christ Blessing Little Children,' which turned out to be the work of his pupil, Eeckhout—a bad blunder, for which, however, he made amends by the successful bargain which he concluded for the country in the purchase of the Peel collection of Dutch pictures, 'perhaps,' says Mr.

Armstrong, 'the finest in the matter of quality that has ever been brought together' (p. 5). Besides this addition, which filled up one of the largest gaps in the collection, Sir William's tenure of office was rendered memorable by the purchase of Mantegna's 'Triumph of Scipio' and the two Michael Angelos. As many as 116 pictures in all were added to the Gallery during these nine years. On his resignation, in 1874, he was succeeded by the present Director, Sir Frederick Burton, whose great knowledge of art history, and accomplishments both as a painter and critic, fitted him pre-eminently for the post. Following Sir Charles Eastlake's example, he has added largely to the different Italian schools, and we are indebted to him in a great measure for the completeness of this portion of the Gallery. To his taste and judgment we owe the purchase of such splendid and well-authenticated works as the Hamilton Palace and Fuller Maitland Botticellis, the two noble Signorellis, and Mantegna's 'Samson and Dalilah,' besides many excellent specimens of the Veronese, Ferrarese, Brescian, and early Sienese and Umbrian schools, which had been hitherto but poorly represented. Again, the present Director has given effect to the strongly-expressed wishes of the nation by the large and valuable additions which have been made on his recommendation to the English school. Between 1824 and 1862 this part of the collection had been enriched by the Vernon pictures and by Turner's generous bequest of his own pictures and drawings, but during that period not a single work by an English painter was bought by the trustees. During the twelve years that Sir Frederick Burton has been in office some thirty fine specimens of the English school have been purchased, including characteristic examples of Morland, Stothard, James Ward, Constable, Wilson, Crome, Cotman, Stark, Blake, Frederick Walker, and Dante Rossetti.

Besides the catholicity of taste which he has thus shown in his recommendations, Sir Frederick has deserved well of his country by his successful conduct of the negotiations which ended in the purchase of Leonardo da Vinci's 'Virgin of the Rocks' from Lord Suffolk in 1880, and of the Blenheim Raphael and the Vandyck equestrian portrait of Charles I. from the Duke of Marlborough in 1885. Both were unique occasions in the history of the Gallery, never likely to occur again, and the loss of such rare and priceless treasures would indeed have been a disastrous event for the country. The Madonna by Leonardo was acquired for 9,000*l.*, a small sum when we consider the beauty of the picture and the extreme

ra-  
est-  
the  
han-  
Mil-  
of t-  
by  
turi-  
the  
on  
late-  
in l-  
Leo-  
form-  
Han-  
Lan-  
to b-  
form-  
of a-  
but  
been  
both  
histo-  
Gall-  
Lom-  
two  
the l-  
little  
is th-  
of th-  
in th-  
proof-  
strom-  
letter-  
that l-  
the p-  
Louv-  
origi-  
ourse-  
Leon-  
Rock-  
unfini-  
may r-  
lingto-  
T



rarity of this great painter's works. Its pedigree is well established, and may be considered as certain as that of any of the four or five pictures which are all the world contains by his hand. It was originally painted for the altar of St. Gottardo in Milan, but was soon removed by Lodovico il Moro to the chapel of the Conception in St. Francesco, in which church it was seen by several writers during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The eldest of these, Lomazzo, a well-known writer on the history of painting, describes it accurately in his *Treatise on Painting*. Old guide-books mention the altar-piece as lately as 1752, and it is not till 1787 that the Abbé Bianconi, in his *Nuova Guida di Milano*, remarks that the picture by Leonardo has been taken away from Milan. The writer's information was correct; for in 1779 an English painter, Gavin Hamilton, who had been lately travelling in Italy, sold Lord Lansdowne a picture which he not only declared positively to be the work of Leonardo da Vinci, but 'a most capital performance of the master, never to be got again.' The existence of another picture, which goes by the same name and presents but a slight variation of the same theme, in the Louvre, has been the cause of much controversy in art circles. Probably both works are in great part by the master's hand; but all the historic evidence that we possess is on the side of the National Gallery Virgin. Not only does it correspond exactly with Lomazzo's description of the altar-piece in San Francesco, but two old copies, one at Milan, the other at Naples, agree with the English picture in representing the Angel supporting the little St. John instead of pointing towards the Child-Christ, as is the case in the Louvre example. The superior beauty of the faces, and the greater perfection of the workmanship in the National Gallery picture is in our eyes a still stronger proof of its genuineness. We are glad to see that Mr. Armstrong is also of this opinion, and Sir Charles Eastlake, in a letter written to Lord Andover on the subject, informed him that M. Passavant and Dr. Waagen, after a careful inspection of the picture, agreed with him that it was far superior to the Louvre 'Vierge aux Rochers,' and in all probability the true original. This being the case, we in England may well count ourselves fortunate in possessing two undoubted works by Leonardo; and while we linger before the Madonna of the Rocks, let us not forget his still more exquisite Virgin in the unfinished cartoon which made all Florence wonder, and which may now be seen every day in the Diploma Gallery at Burlington House.

The great sum paid for the Blenheim Raphael—the

Ansidei Madonna, as it is called, from the family for which it was originally painted at Perugia—has given the picture a notoriety far greater than that of Leonardo's Virgin. The circumstances of the sale, and the outcry produced in certain quarters at this pretended waste of public money, is still fresh in our memories. But although 72,000*l.* was the largest price ever paid for a single picture, it must be remembered that never before in the present century had a Raphael of the very first rank been offered for sale. Not only is the picture in excellent preservation, uninjured by cleaning and restoration, but it is entirely by the master's hand, painted by him without the aid of pupils, in those happy days when, with the freshness and holiness of youth still in his heart, he came to Florence, and, stirred to new enthusiasm by the wonders of art about him, became for the first time conscious of all the fulness of his powers.

Henceforth, at least, the old reproach can be no longer heard. With the Leonardo Virgin and the Raphael Madonna no one can say that the National Gallery of England is without masterpieces of the highest rank. In this respect alone it will compare with any gallery in Europe.

Another memorable event in the present Director's administration has been the classification of the pictures for the first time on a scientific system. Sir Charles Eastlake had, it is well known, long ago advocated this arrangement, which was, in fact, a necessary sequel of his principles in making purchases. Half the usefulness of a gallery, both for students and for the general public, is wasted where no attempt is made to hang pictures in their proper order. But during many years the inconvenience of the building and the want of space, which made itself increasingly felt in proportion as the collection grew in numbers, presented hopeless difficulties, and made a thorough reform impossible. In 1838 a division of the pictures into British and foreign schools was attempted, and in 1853 the Dutch and Italian masters were each given a room to themselves. Some attempts at partial classification were again made in 1856, when most of the recently acquired Turners had to be removed to Marlborough House, and in 1860, when a large screen was erected to afford fresh space. But with each new addition the walls became more crowded and the confusion greater. Rembrandts had to be hung with Italian paintings, French works by the side of Dutch and Flemish, and not even the five rooms placed at the disposal of the Gallery by the removal of the Royal Academy to Burlington House were found sufficient to supply the requisite

space. At length the Government agreed to build ; and when, in 1876, seven new rooms were opened to the public, the British pictures were once more brought to Trafalgar Square, and the different schools were again separated and hung in more regular order.

That year Mr. Wynn Ellis left the Gallery a bequest of ninety-one pictures, which, by the terms of his will, were to be kept together for ten years, a condition which prevented any classification of those works until the expiration of the term. At the same time, the rapid rate at which purchases were made, once more rendered systematic arrangement impossible. One expedient after another was tried. Modern British pictures were banished to the old rooms on the ground floor ; a number of portraits were removed to the National Portrait Gallery at South Kensington. The collection was weeded : some of its worst pictures were sold, and others were lent to provincial institutions. Still the cry for space was heard, and in 1884 a further extension of the building was agreed upon.

The construction of five new rooms and a central staircase, which should form a fitting approach to the Gallery, was assigned to Mr. Taylor, of Her Majesty's Office of Works, who has ably discharged a very difficult task, and done his best to join the old and new buildings into one. By the end of last May the workmen's labours were finished, and the greater part of June was spent by the Director and his staff in re-hanging the pictures as far as possible according to their separate schools and periods. The arrangement was by no means an easy matter, when we remember the different sizes and shapes of the pictures, and the difficulty of sorting the separate schools in a building not designed, as that at Berlin was, with an express view to this scholastic division, but built at different times, and pieced together bit by bit. Under the circumstances we may well congratulate ourselves on the result, and the authorities deserve the greatest credit for the skill and taste with which they have grouped these twelve hundred works of art. On the first Monday in July 1887 the new rooms were thrown open to the public, and for the first time since the foundation of the Gallery the pictures were seen arranged in proper order, and displayed to the best advantage on the walls.

The new grand staircase supplies a want which had been long felt, and with its pillars of red African marble and side staircases leading to the British schools, produces a sufficiently imposing effect. At the top of the central flight we find our-

selves in a handsome vestibule adorned with medallions of great artists, and decorated in a simple and pleasant manner. Here on our right and left, looking well on the sage-green walls, hang the fine fragments of Spinello Aretino's frescoes recently presented by Sir Henry Layard. They consist of an archangel and a group of rebel angels, and are among the best examples of fourteenth century work in the Gallery.

We now enter a fine new room (No. 1), which with the three small cabinets on the right and left (Nos. 2, 3, and 4), is devoted to Tuscan art. Here we can study the whole history of the revival of painting from the dead art of Margaritone, and trace the gradual progress of the mighty revolution worked by Giotto and his followers both in Florence and Siena.

The low ebb to which art had sunk under these Byzantine influences, which were supreme in Italy until the close of the thirteenth century, is excellently set forth by Mr. Monkhouse in his little book, three-fourths of which deals with the Tuscan pictures of the Gallery:—

‘The artists of the thirteenth century in Italy had what is almost worse than no instruction; they were taught to draw badly, without reference to Nature. Under the patronage of the Church they produced paintings of events from the sacred writings, the legends of the Church, and the lives of the Saints, but these were done to fixed rules. Not only the subjects, but the attitudes, the composition, the types of the faces, the folds of the draperies, and even the colours, and the method of laying them on, down to the minutest details, were traditional. . . . Painters, therefore, in Italy at the time of Cimabue were mechanics, with little more freedom of will than house-painters—painting crucifixes, and “Holy Families,” “St. Jeromes,” and “St. Johns,” according to fixed ecclesiastical patterns. Art as an expression of the artist’s thought and feeling was completely dead. . . . If we fancy how absolutely unconnected with any sense of delight or human feeling painting must have been in the days when such painters as Margaritone were at the head of their profession, we may dimly understand with what ecstasy was hailed the very first gleam of life in the long-dead art. For this reason it is worth while to study these pictures, until we feel how grim and ugly and lifeless they are, and how much pleasure would disappear from existence if all pictures were now like these. So when we turn to our Cimabue (565), “The Madonna and Child enthroned with adoring Angels,” we shall better perceive what breath of life it contains and enter more into the feelings of the Florentines when they first saw a similar sight. . . . Our own picture is not so fine as that in the Rucellai Chapel in Santa Maria Novella, but yet it is like the famous work which produced such enthusiasm at Florence, and is far more beautiful and natural than the work of Margaritone. The face of the Virgin, though of the type

of Byzantine tradition, is not only awful but tender; the angels who bear her company have a touch of human kindness mixed with their reverence, and the folds of their raiment fall in pleasant curves. In a word, nature has been sought and found, however sparingly; the artist has spoken, not only with the thunder of the ecclesiastic to the fear of the layman, but with the voice of a man to the heart of his brother' (p. 12).

Then came Giotto, the bold innovator, who threw off the old yoke and dared to paint the faces and forms he saw about him, the blue sky and the green leaves, the changeful emotions and common incidents of everyday life, and in so doing made himself famous for all the years to come. Unfortunately the National Gallery has no worthy example of the great reformer who made all future progress possible. Tempera paintings by Giotto are rarely to be seen out of Florence, but there is at least one such to be seen in England, that little picture of the 'Death of the Virgin,' which, when it hung in the church of Ognissanti, filled Michael Angelo's great soul with wonder, and made him say that the story could not be expressed in a more true and lively manner. It was exhibited a few winters ago at Burlington House, and is still, we believe, in the possession of Mr. Bromley Davenport. Certainly no lovelier bit of old Florentine work exists than this precious panel, which in luminous colour, in force and pathos of narrative, is equal to the finest art of later times. If ever this picture, which Giotto painted and Michael Angelo praised, should find its way into the national collection, the Gallery will boast a treasure such as no other public museum contains.

The different tendencies of Florentine art in the fifteenth century are very fully illustrated. Fra Angelico, in whose creations the spiritual expression of the old school found its highest development, is well represented by a panel which he painted for his own convent church at Fiesole, 'Our Lord in Glory surrounded by Saints.' Each face in that celestial band breathes with the tender devotion which meets us at every turn in the cells of San Marco, and we are reminded of old Vasari's words concerning this very picture: 'They are so beautiful they seem to belong to Paradise.' The realistic and scientific side of the school is shown in good specimens of Paolo Uccelli and Piero di Cosimo, and the same close observation of nature and striving after technical mastery appears in Pollajuoli's masterpiece, the 'Martyrdom of St. Sebastian.' Other symptoms of the newly-awakened intellectual life of the age and of the increasing interest felt by artists in the beautiful world about them appear in the works

of another group of painters, Fra Lippo and his pupils. These men are remarkably well represented, especially the most powerful and interesting among them, Sandro Botticelli, the friend of Lorenzo dei Medici and the follower of Savonarola, in whose art the revived love of classical myths and the mystic devotion of the Frate's sermons are so curiously blended. In speaking of Botticelli we must remind our readers of a fine altar-piece by a contemporary Sieneſe painter, Matteo di Giovanni, recently added to the Gallery and now placed in the little cabinet which holds the early Sieneſe pictures. It is an 'Assumption' in a wonderful state of preservation, and remarkable for the beauty and joyous movement of the dancing angels, who, akin to Sandro's cherubs, circle on the clouds in the Madonna's train.

The large hall contains many noble examples of riper Florentine art, foremost among them Leonardo's great 'Virgin' and the two unfinished Michael Angelos, the 'Entombment' and the 'Holy Family.' The genuineness of both these pictures has been called in question, but we are glad to find that the best recent critics are returning to the old belief, and appear to be of Mr. Armstrong's opinion that both are 'unmistakably signed all over' (p. 17). Certainly if they are not by the hand which carved the 'Pietà' of St. Peter's and painted the 'Madonna' of the Tribune and the 'Eve' of the Sistine, it is hard to know what other master could equal either the powers of draughtsmanship or the rugged vigour of conception we find here displayed. One gap, we may note in passing, strikes us as not yet filled up among these later Florentines. It is the absence of any work by the hand of Fra Bartolommeo, whose consummate grace and mastery of drawing deserves to be represented here, and who is almost the only painter of note whose name is missing from our long list of great Florentines.

Leaving the four rooms sacred to Tuscan art, we enter a fifth which is occupied by the schools of Bologna and Ferrara, and contains the well-known 'Pietà' by Francia, still the most touchingly beautiful rendering of the familiar theme, and that splendid example of Ercole Grandi which we owe to Sir Frederick Burton's selection, besides two works by Lorenzo Costa, the artist who forms the connecting link between the schools of the two cities which shared with Florence and Umbria the honour of preparing the way for Raphael. Through this room, then, we enter the great gallery (No. 6) devoted to the works of Umbrian masters, where, occupying a central position which enables it to be seen



from the top of the stairs through the long vista of marble doorways, is the great Raphael 'Madonna.' On either side are works by the great Urbinate. To the right the fair 'Virgin' of the Aldobrandini family, with the green hillside and towers dear to the painter's heart, and the pearly-tinted St. Katharine; to the left that loveliest of all youthful dreams, the 'Vision of a Knight,' who in his slumber sees on one hand the enchanted form of Pleasure offering him the flowers of life, while on the other Duty, holding out a sword and book, calls him to tread the nobler path. The atmosphere of that famous court of Urbino, where fair ladies and renowned scholars from all parts of Italy met and reasoned of love and virtue in the Duchess's rooms till the dawn broke on the hill tops, still seems to haunt this exquisite little picture, but the influence of Perugino is none the less strongly felt in the drawing and colouring, and it was probably painted in the early years of the sixteenth century, when Raphael had already spent some time at Perugia.

Besides the noble group of Raphaels there is much to make us linger in this room. The whole history of Umbrian art is, as it were, spread before us in unbroken sequence, and we can follow its course from Fiorenzo's delicate fancies and Niccolò da Foligno's more vigorous but coarser strain of thought, from the splendid specimens of Melozzo da Forlì and of Piero della Francesca—both men in advance of their time—to the great achievements of Signorelli and Perugino. Three pictures of this last-named master are here, one early 'Madonna,' a 'Virgin and Saints' in his latest manner, and the triptych from the Certosa, by far the best picture he ever painted, and both in colour and expression one of the supreme works of its kind.

The new wing of the Gallery ends here, and turning to the right we enter the large room (No. 7), once occupied by a confused medley of Italian works, but now given up to the North Italian schools, and, chief among these, to Venice. From the simple frankness and directness of the old Florentines, from the sweet refinement and tender yearning of Umbrian faces, we turn to the jewel-like colour, the fuller forms, and more living splendour of Venetian painters. From the low hills, the slender pines, and still green waters of Perugino's and Raphael's backgrounds we pass to the rocky crags of the dolomites and the level line of far blue plains stretching towards the sea, to the uplands of Cadore and the jagged peaks of Titian's home. Here again the new arrangement of the pictures makes us for the first time fully realize the riches of the Gallery in this department. Titian's 'Bacchus and

Ariadne,' a work which, in triumphant glow of colour, in freedom and joyousness of movement, remains unsurpassed by any of his creations, has come to join its companions, and with the 'Madonna of St. Katharine,' the doubtful 'Ariosto,' and the 'Noli me Tangere,' makes up a group which rivals the Raphaels of the last room. We may count ourselves still more fortunate in the possession of so many fine Giovanni Bellinis when we think how rarely these are to be seen out of Venice. Even if the 'Death of Peter Martyr' with its lovely wooded background must really be given up, as Mr. Armstrong suggests (p. 23), to his pupil Catena, we have still three first-class and undoubtedly genuine works: the noble blue-draped 'Virgin' (280), the solemn 'Agony in the Garden' (726), with the crimson flush of sunset lingering above the bare heights and the towers of Jerusalem, and the portrait in robes of state of brave old 'Doge Leonardo Loredano.' This last work, so finely painted and excellently preserved, was executed when Giovanni Bellini was considerably over seventy years of age, and reminds us how Albert Dürer, coming to Venice in 1506, found the great painter, then not far off eighty, still hard at work, and wrote home to his friends at Nürnberg, 'He is very old, but still the best painter.' Most of Bellini's large band of scholars are also represented, and so are the later Venetians: Paris Bordone, and Paul Veronese, whose large work of the 'Family of Darius before Alexander,' containing many life-like portraits, was bought thirty years ago, while the 'Dream of St. Helena' came from the Munro sale in 1878. Tintoretto, on the other hand, is but feebly represented, and the only work of Giorgione we have to show is the study of the knight in armour for the Castelfranco altar-piece. Even the genuineness of this sketch has of late been disputed, it seems to us unjustly. The Brescian and Veronese pictures have been allowed to remain in the large room, but this has necessitated the banishment of the Crivellis to a small cabinet (No. 8), where they hang by the side of our noble series of Mantegnas. If the 'Triumphs of Cæsar' could be brought from Hampton Court to join these last we should have a magnificent display of works by the painter who, above all others, represents that revived sense of the divinity of form which was so marked a feature of the Italian Renaissance. Another room (No. 9) is now devoted to Lombard pictures, including the works of Leonardo's followers, Luini and Beltraffio, and the Correggios, which ought, strictly speaking, to be grouped with the Ferrara school.

The next three rooms are now occupied by the Dutch and Flemish pictures. The first of these (No. 10) has been hardly

to  
dy  
Ch  
'A  
in  
or  
a f  
loss  
the  
in  
dre  
The  
coll  
lop  
Ger  
teri  
cust  
arti  
was  
him  
now  
(p.  
repr  
and  
mas  
the  
pote  
acco  
to p  
fami

actu  
sign  
succe  
Dem  
the N  
it by

S  
Galle  
occup  
dispe  
Flem  
name  
sugg

touched, and contains the great works of Rubens, of Van-dyck, and of Rembrandt. Here is the equestrian portrait of Charles I., bought for the sum of 17,000*l.* at the same time as the 'Ansidei Madonna' from Blenheim, a work of priceless value in English eyes whether we consider its historical associations or its pictorial merits. As we look at the 'Chapeau de Poil,' a fine landscape by Rubens, it is impossible not to regret the loss of the incomparable portraits by this painter which, once the pride of Blenheim, now adorn the house of the Rothschilds in Paris, in spite of all the remonstrances and petitions addressed to Parliament on the subject at the time of the sale. The next room (No. 11) has been given back to the Peel collection, and we see Hobbema's famous avenue of straight-lopped trees, Metsu's marvellous painted conversation pieces, Gerard Dow's 'Poulterer's Shop,' De Hooghe's splendid interior—a very gem of brilliant painting—all hanging in the accustomed places. Mr. Armstrong remarks with truth that this artist, whose pictures are so strangely full of air and daylight, was appreciated by Englishmen when no one else understood him, and that, consequently, 'three-fourths of his works are now in this country, and three of the best in Trafalgar Square' (p. 36). Ruysdael, the greatest of Dutch landscape-painters, is represented by no less than twelve examples, Teniers by fifteen, and Terburg by the dainty little 'Guitar-lesson' and his masterpiece, 'The Peace of Münster' (896), which represents the ratification of the treaty by the Spanish and Dutch plenipotentiaries in 1648. Mr. Armstrong gives an interesting account of the history of this picture, which the artist refused to part from to the end of his life, and which belonged to his family for many years.

'It afterwards passed into the hands of Talleyrand, and was actually hanging in the room in which the allied sovereigns met to sign the treaty of 1814. From the Talleyrand collection is passed successively through those of the Duc de Berri, Prince Anatole Demidoff, and the late Lord Hertford. In 1874 it was presented to the National Gallery by Sir Richard Wallace. The price given for it by Lord Hertford at the Demidoff sale was 8,800*l.*' (p. 36).

Several of the best Cuyps and Van de Velde's in the Gallery belong to the Wynn Ellis collection, which formerly occupied a room to itself, but now these pictures have been dispersed, and Room 12 has become the home of the early Flemish masters. A great deal of confusion exists as to the names and styles of these old Flemings, and Mr. Armstrong's suggestion that the Royal Academy should devote one of

their winter exhibitions to the school with the express object of clearing up disputed points of authorship is worthy of attention. Fortunately, no shadow of doubt can be attached to the three pictures which bear the great name of Van Eyck. All three are in a wonderful state of preservation, and that new varnish of his discovery has kept the colours pure and brilliant during all these four hundred years. The finest of all is that which represents Jan Arnolfini, merchant of Lucca, and his wife Jeanne, standing side by side in their bedchamber, as the painter saw them in the city of Bruges in the year 1434. Every detail of the room is painted with miniature-like finish and care. The diamond panes of the window through which the light streams, the round mirror with its medallions of sacred subjects, the wooden shoes on the floor, and the fur-trimmed robes, are all rendered with infinite love and pains, but the great beauty of the picture lies in the expression and gesture of Arnolfini, as, solemnly raising one hand, while the other clasps that of his wife, he implores the benediction of heaven on himself, his spouse, and their offspring. A strange accident brought this picture to England. It belonged originally to the collection of the Spanish Regents of the Netherlands, and then passed into private hands in Brussels. There it was seen by General Hay, in the house where he was carried after being wounded at Waterloo. On his recovery he brought the picture with him to England, and sold it in 1842 to the trustees of the Gallery.

Among the very few German pictures we find two or three examples of the charming old Cologne masters, one of which is ascribed to Meister Stephan, the painter of the 'Dombild,' while the names of Albert Dürer and, stranger still, that of Hans Holbein, who worked so much in England, are altogether absent. The last gap is temporarily supplied by the presence of a good portrait—that of 'Christina of Denmark'—lent by the Duke of Norfolk; and surely, if no other means of filling the void can be found, the Holbein portraits at Hampton Court might with advantage be brought here.

Turning to the French school, which now occupies Room 14, the collection is, as we all know, exceptionally rich in Claudes, but poor in good specimens of eighteenth century art. The landscape school, which has thrown so much lustre on modern French painting, is altogether unrepresented, and, seeing the extraordinary prices that are now paid for Corots, for Rousseaus, and for Millets, this is hardly surprising. But it is always in the power of some generous individuals to supply these omissions, and we can imagine no greater boon

to the nation than the gift, for instance, of a picture by the hand which painted the 'Semeur' and the 'Angelus.'

The well-known examples of the Spanish school remain in undisturbed possession of Room 15, and have received no striking addition of late years, with the exception of Velasquez's fine half-length of 'Philip IV.,' bought at the Hamilton sale, and Sir John Savile Lumley's gift of a 'Christ at the Column,' ascribed to the same artist. Room 13 is still peopled with works of the late Bolognese and Roman schools, who, if they are to be seen at all, are certainly best seen apart from earlier Italian paintings, and with them are the Guardis and the Canalettos, which belong to the same period of decline.

The remaining two rooms east of the new staircase, and the five rooms of the west wing, are entirely filled with British pictures. No. 16 contains the works of Sir Joshua Reynolds and Gainsborough, some of which will be found to have overflowed into the vestibules at the head of the stairs. No. 17 is chiefly occupied by Hogarths and Wilsons. Nos. 19 and 22 are still devoted to Turner, while the remaining three contain the works of the later schools from the days of Crome and Copley to those of Landseer and Walker.

Here, again, we see how much Sir Frederick Burton has done to improve this important part of the collection. The art of England is now fairly represented in both its chief branches of portraiture and landscape. We can study Reynolds and Gainsborough in such characteristic examples as the portraits of 'Dr. Johnson' and 'Mrs. Siddons,' we can see the fair face which laid a spell on Romney's heart and brain, and wonder at the cunning and penetration of character, the marvellous technical skill displayed by Hogarth in his own likeness or in that of 'Polly Peachum.' We can see the most different aspects of nature revealed by Constable and Turner, and note how the one records each vivid fact in grass, trees, and cornfields with a rapture of delight which turns common prose into living poetry, while the other penetrates the loveliest secrets of atmosphere and colour by the fine use of his imagination. We can see how deeply Richard Wilson felt the charm of Italian skies and groves, and how Crome and his followers discovered a beauty in Norfolk 'broads' and sandy shores akin to that which the Dutch painters found in their own country of flats and dykes. Again, we can admire Hogarth's forcible brush-work and powers of satire, the delicate colour of Stothard, the highly-praised flesh-tints of Etty, and the mystic imaginations of William Blake; or con-

sider the distinctive features which mark the art of Wilkie and Mulready, or of James Ward, of Morland, and of Landseer.

A few names which deserve to be remembered are still missing: William Dyce, the painter of 'King Arthur and his Knights,' in the Robing Room at Westminster, has surely earned an honourable place here, and George Mason should be represented if only to show that there is a poetic side to English peasant-life. And, if the National Gallery is to illustrate the whole of English art, there can be no doubt that water-colour as well as oil-painting must find a place at Trafalgar Square, and that the drawings of David Cox and Copley Fielding should be added to the precious legacy of Turner, and to Mr. Henderson's more recent bequest of De Wint's and Cattermole's sketches. It is also to be hoped that, whenever the opportunity presents itself, the authorities will remove the Ary Scheffers from their present position in Room 21, where their crude hues clash as unpleasantly with the lovely colour of Frederick Walker's 'Vagrants,' as their sentiment jars with the delicate purity of Rossetti's 'Annunciation' on the screen close by.

When we consider the great variety and wealth of the collection, and the history of its gradual formation, we can only congratulate ourselves that the nation should have acquired so magnificent a possession at comparatively small cost. The whole sum expended in the purchase of pictures up to the present time has not exceeded a total of 400,000*l.*; and, according to their present market value, the collection is worth four or five times that sum. The Peel collection, purchased in 1871 for 75,000*l.*, has been lately valued at 250,000*l.*, and many of the choicest works in the Gallery have been bought for a mere song. Giovanni Bellini's 'Doge Loredan' cost 630*l.*; Botticelli's most admired 'Madonna,' 159*l.*; Van Eyck's 'Portrait of Jan Arnolfini and his Wife,' 630*l.*; Paris Bordone's 'Crimson Lady,' 258*l.*; Raphael's 'Vision of a Knight,' 1,000 guineas. To-day a little Raphael of the same period—the 'Three Graces' in the Dudley collection—sells for 25,000*l.*; and a more than doubtful work by the same master—Mr. Morris Moore's 'Apollo and Marsyas'—is bought by the Louvre for 8,000*l.*

Some blunders there have been, of course; some errors of judgment have been made, and some precious chances lost; but on the whole the administration of the Gallery has been admirably conducted. The task of buying pictures must always be a difficult and invidious one. Even the best connoisseurs will rarely agree as to the respective merits of single works



of art, and hardly a picture of note has been purchased for the Gallery without exciting recriminations in some quarters. But the clamour dies away, and Raphaels and Leonardos remain to be the pride and joy of generations to come.

There is in the long run, we believe, no more popular way of expending the public money than in the judicious purchase of works by those great masters whose abiding excellence has been recognized by the universal consent of ages. The Government which had Mr. Gladstone at its head in 1885 is far more likely to be blamed for allowing the three great Rubens' portraits to leave our shores than for giving too large a sum for the most celebrated of the Blenheim pictures. When, in 1834, Lord Grey hesitated to give 11,500*l.* for two Correggios, David Wilkie, whose opinion was consulted, replied that the sum named was certainly a large one, but that he would decidedly concur in giving that amount 'rather than let them go out of the country, considering the rarity of such specimens.' The same feeling was practically expressed in the petition addressed to the Prime Minister by the English artists, who, in 1885, declared 'that a stigma would be attached to this generation if these pictures are allowed to leave our shores;' and in the resolution signed amongst other members of the House of Commons, by the labour representatives, urging the Government 'to step outside of the hard line of a severe economy in order at one stroke to raise to a higher level the collection of pictures of which the whole nation is proud, and which is the source of widespread and refined enjoyment to the poor as well as to the rich.' Such, we are firmly persuaded, will always be the language and sentiments of the English people on similar occasions. As one by one the great collections of ancient and historic houses are brought to the hammer, there is at least some consolation in feeling that the choicest treasures they contain are not lost to England, but not only pass into a collection where they receive the greatest care, but become accessible to persons of all classes. For—it cannot be too often repeated—a national gallery is not only intended to be a school of training 'for artists and students,' but is above all meant to be an instrument in forming the taste and judgment of the nation to which it belongs; in raising successive generations to higher levels of thought and aspirations; in shedding abroad an atmosphere of sweetness and light, and helping men to live with steadfastness of purpose for all great and noble ends—

'Im Ganzen, Guten, Schönen,  
Resolut zu leben.'

## ART. IV.—LIBERATIONIST FALLACIES.

1. *The Case for Disestablishment.* Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Control. (London, 1884.)
2. *Modern Pleas for Church Establishments.* By Rev. H. W. PARKINSON. Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Control. (London.)
3. *Religious Equality, in its Connection with National and Religious Life.* By ALEXANDER MACLAREN, D.D. Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Control. (London.)
4. *The Newspaper Religious Census and its Lessons.* Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Control. (London, 1882.)
5. *Practical Suggestions relative to the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church of England.* Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Control. (London, 1877-1884.)
6. Tracts and Leaflets for Distribution :—e.g. *The Good Old Church.—Our Church.—The Church and the People.—Modern Persecution.—The real Truth about Church Property.—A Question that concerns everybody.—What should be done with the Tithes.—The Agricultural Labourer on the Established Church.—The Established Church in England and Wales.—Are the Clergy State-paid?—Tithes and the Poor.—Glebe Lands and Allotments.—The Church Property Question.—What should be done with the Tithes?—Not a Penny!—What has it done for you? A Word to Agricultural Labourers, &c., &c.* Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Control. (London, 1877-1887.)

IN September 1887 the Executive Committee of the Liberation Society issued a circular to its supporters in which the following passage occurs : 'It is, therefore, of great importance that the work of education, which has been so efficacious in the past, should be continued with unremitting activity' (the italics are ours), 'that there may be preparedness for another General Election, or for any event which may suddenly make Disestablishment the most pressing question of the hour.' What is the nature of this work of education which has proved so efficacious in the past, and which is to be actively continued in the future? We propose to answer this question by examining

some of the publications of the Liberation Society, and to inquire from these sources

(I.) *How the Established Church is supported.*

(II.) *What it costs.*

(III.) *What are the relations of the parochial clergy towards their parishioners.*

Our aim in this inquiry must not be misunderstood. Men may and do differ widely respecting the advantages or disadvantages of an Established Church ; but, allowing the widest latitude of opinions, we plead for some limitation of the means by which those opinions are propagated. The arguments, not the views, of the Liberation Society are the objects of our criticism. We seek to stir up no acrimonious discussion between ourselves and our opponents ; we shall therefore endeavour to illustrate our case from points which are so plain that they cannot be controverted.

It is because the Liberation Society contains among its supporters many men who are animated by a genuine, though in our view mistaken, zeal for the cause of religion, and many others whose personal honour—whatever may be their religious or non-religious principles—is unimpeached and unimpeachable, that we are induced to put together the following pages. If we find that the Liberation Society issues two different classes of publications, one calculated to mislead ignorant electors, the other to maintain its character for fair and open dealing ; that it uses as arguments pleas which it elsewhere confesses to be groundless, or relies upon quotations which are palpably garbled ; that it insinuates against the parochial clergy the unsupported charge of understating their incomes, or accuses them of filching money from the pockets of the poor upon evidence which it scruples to lay before the educated classes ; that it spares no pains to heap upon the rural parsons every sort of obloquy, to discredit their charities, and blacken their public characters ; that it openly offers the property of the Church as a naked, undisguised bribe to the taxpayer, the farmer, and the labourer ; that it whets the appetite for public plunder by exaggerating clerical wealth, and by endorsing estimates which, from its own publications, can be shown to be excessive ;—if we find all this in the Liberationist publications—and we hope to establish each of these points beyond the possibility of reasonable dispute—we shall use the result in two ways. In the first place we shall confidently appeal to our honourable antagonists, whether Nonconformists or Secularists, to repudiate the treacherous allies who fight their battle ; in the second place we shall be

able to value at their true worth petitions presented in favour of Disestablishment and Disendowment, when they are thus bred by misconceptions of the truth, fed on misstatements of fact, and swollen by a literature which is in strange variance with the religion it professes to uphold.

No one who is conversant with the Reports of the Liberation Society can affect to despise the influence which it exercises. Between the years 1870-1 and 1883-4 the Society expended little less than 150,000*l.* in promoting the cause of Disestablishment and Disendowment. It has printed and published millions of tracts, pamphlets, and leaflets; it has held innumerable meetings, and delivered countless addresses. The Society's Report for 1880-1 stated that progress was evidently being made among farmers and agricultural labourers. A year later 1,425,270 tracts were distributed; 'a house-to-house distribution of tracts was made, dealing with various aspects of the question of Disestablishment and Disendowment.' In the Society's Report for 1883 we are told that 'no fewer than 3,077,677 publications have been distributed during the past three years,' and that 'advantage has been taken of the depressed condition of the rural districts to interest both farmers and labourers in changes which may have an important bearing on their future prospects.' Again, in the Report for 1885: 'In view of the demand for publications which will be needed for the purposes of the approaching election, the Society's stock of tracts and pamphlets has been largely increased. There have also been issued some special publications for the use of both candidates and electors, as well as a set of leaflets specially written for the new voters in the rural districts.'

The Society thus assumed the responsibility of educating ignorant voters in the intelligent exercise of the franchise. No body of men could, on their public profession, be better fitted for the task. The association was formed more than forty years ago by 'earnest, Christian-minded men,' chiefly influenced by religious considerations, 'constrained by a deep sense of obligation to Jesus Christ,' who advocated a measure which they believed to be 'imperatively demanded by the authority of the New Testament.' That Disestablishment and Disendowment would be urged with all the force of sincere conviction is to be expected, especially as at every stage in its progress the Society encouraged itself with the reflection that God is on its side. 'It is a stupendous work which is before us, needing all the faith and all the power that have ever been given to man. He who is the Creator of all the moral and spiritual forces of the world will, if we be fit to go on with the

work, which we believe to be His work, give us all that we need to carry it on to the end.'<sup>1</sup> 'We have pledged ourselves deeply; let our pledges be fulfilled in the sight of God, as well as of man, and with the strengthening belief that His help, as well as man's, will not be wanting!'<sup>2</sup> At the Conference in 1876 the chairman said: 'They knew they had right upon their side, and, God helping them, it was their intention to brace themselves anew for the work.' Again, in 1882: 'It was God's cause, and He would raise up instruments to carry it on.'

Here, then, is an association of pure-minded men, influenced by the highest motives, deeply sensible of the tremendous responsibility they have assumed, conscientiously believing themselves to be appointed instruments in the hands of God. From a Society so constituted it is reasonable to expect tactics which are scrupulously upright and honourable, although no fair means of success be neglected, and writings which are uniformly courteous and truthful, however strongly they may advocate their sacred cause. We shall see how far these reasonable expectations are in fact realized.

#### I. *How the Established Church is supported.*

In discussing the question of Disestablishment and Disendowment the Liberation Society has reversed its former policy. Originally it insisted on the necessity of Disestablishment, and passed by the question of Disendowment. Now the endowments are everything, and the establishment little or nothing. In our criticism of the pamphlets of the Liberation Society we shall pass by the pleas urged for Disestablishment, although they offer a tempting field, and confine ourselves to those arguments which are directed to the breeches-pocket.

The Liberation Society approaches the question, 'how the State Church is supported and what it costs?' with one general caution. For information respecting the value of the property now devoted to religious purposes,

'the nation is, to a great extent, dependent on the clergy and the dignitaries of the Establishment; and they have invariably shown the greatest reluctance and carelessness—to use no harsher word—in supplying the information they have been required to give.'<sup>3</sup>

In other words, the Society is obliged to rely on the figures given in the Clergy List, and, though these are returned by the clergy themselves, they are untrustworthy. Not only so, but

<sup>1</sup> Leading Article on Conference of Society, *Liberator*, May 15, 1871.

<sup>2</sup> Leading Article on Triennial Conference of 1874, *Liberator*.

<sup>3</sup> *Case for Disestablishment*, p. 63.

they are untrustworthy in the direction of the pecuniary interests of the clergy.

'The revenue of the Establishment in Wales is 256,979*l.* These figures are compiled from the Clergy List. But it is well known that the Clergy List gives the income of the parochial clergy at from ten to twenty-five per cent. less than their actual value. It may safely be assumed, therefore, that, allowing for the recent endowments, the public property by which the Establishment in Wales is maintained is not less than 270,000*l.* to 280,000*l.*'<sup>1</sup>

If this pamphlet stood alone, it might be supposed that the Society intends to accuse the Welsh clergy only of that carelessness in matters of fact—to use no harsher word—which some authorities attribute to the inhabitants of Wales. But the accusation is general in its character. In the *Case for Disestablishment* (p. 64) 'it is believed' that the Clergy List 'understates the value of the livings to the extent of from ten to twenty per cent.' On p. 115 of the same work, it is said to be 'well known that the Clergy List gives the incomes of the parochial clergy at from ten to twenty-five per cent. less than their actual value.' In the first quotation it is '*believed*,' in the second it is '*well known*,' that understatement takes place. With increased confidence comes an increase in the gravity of the charge; the maximum of understatement rises from one-fifth to one-fourth of the income. Has the Liberation Society any substantial ground for the insinuation that the Established clergy allow their interests to overpower their accuracy? Can the Society support, except by force of assertion, this charge of understatement which by a euphemism only it designates as carelessness?

The pamphlets of the Society do not hesitate to offer direct pecuniary inducements to the raw, inexperienced electors of 1885, exercising the franchise for the first time, to vote for Disestablishment and Disendowment:—

'*Do you wish for a reduction of taxation, the burden of which presses so heavily on the people? Then bear in mind that the State Church in England and Wales alone holds property worth several millions a year! This belongs to the nation, not to the Church, which now receives it only by permission of the Legislature, and on conditions which can at any time be altered. The clergy are simply public functionaries, receiving their pay from the State, which can dispense with their services when it thinks proper. Now these ecclesiastical funds . . . would pay off part of the National Debt, or enable the Government largely to reduce the taxation of the country. This,*

<sup>1</sup> Pamphlet headed, *Mr. Dillwyn's Motion for Disestablishment in Wales.*



therefore, is a taxpayer's question, and as such, are you not interested in it?'<sup>1</sup>

Or again—

'During recent years there has been, in many parts of the country, an alarming increase in local burdens. What could be better than a national scheme whereby the tithes might be appropriated *pro rata* in easement of these burdens. While such an application would benefit every ratepayer in the country, it would especially be of service to the farmer, &c. It is not maintained that devoting the tithes to the easement of local burdens would put an end to agricultural distress; but it *is* contended that it would assist in that direction. It would help the farmer at a point where the pressure is often most acutely felt.'<sup>2</sup>

Again—

'It is admitted that one of the best means of raising the position of the labourer would be a wide extension of the allotment system. Why should not these lands (glebe lands) be used for the purpose? The question is one for the labourers themselves. They now have the vote, and can make their voices heard. If they wish it, this great boon may be made one of the first results of the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church.'<sup>3</sup>

In these and other leaflets, circulated gratuitously among ignorant, inexperienced voters, direct appeals are made to the pockets of the taxpayer, the farmer, and the agricultural labourer. It is stated, as we shall presently see, that the annual value of the national property enjoyed by the Established Church amounts to the enormous sum of 10,884,400*l.*; it is suggested that there need be no delay, that the voters can determine the immediate application of the money, that they have but to declare for Disendowment and the boon will be theirs. Very different is the language used in the 'Suggestions for Disestablishment and Disendowment prepared by the Special Committee of the Liberation Society in 1877,' adopted as the programme of the Society, and printed in the *Case for Disestablishment* (Appendix, p. 184). There it is admitted that 'when the English Church is disestablished there may be no considerable surplus for years to come,' and that 'when that surplus becomes a reality, instead of existing in imagination only, the nation will decide on its appropriation with reference to the wants and feelings of the period, and is not likely to be bound by proposals made years before.' Here the Society is addressing the educated and intelligent

<sup>1</sup> *A Question that Concerns Everybody*, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *What should be done with the Tithes*, pp. 3, 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Glebe Lands and Allotments*.

classes ; in the leaflets, speaking to the new voters, to the ignorant and inexperienced, it appeals from reason to greed, from arguments to bribes.

It will be remembered that in November 1885 a Conference was held in the City Temple on the subject of Disestablishment and Disendowment. At that meeting, in order to soothe irritation caused by the root-and branch programme of the Liberation Society, a Mr. Fisher, an accredited representative, if not the secretary, of the Society, assured the assembled audience that the programme was merely tentative, a collection of hints for the discussion of a great public question, a contribution to the general stock of ideas.<sup>1</sup> At the very moment when Mr. Fisher made this statement, and for years previously, pamphlets bearing the *imprimatur* of the Society, whose accredited representative he was, were being circulated by the agents of the Society among the rural electors, bribing them by the proceeds of a still more sweeping scheme to vote for Disestablishment and Disendowment. In those pamphlets the *National* property enjoyed by the Established Church is made to include all the cathedrals and churches in the land, irrespective of when and how they were built, and every possible source of ecclesiastical revenue is comprehended in an estimate which exceeds the highest calculation that can be found in the *Case for Disestablishment* by nearly a million and a half. And this monstrous valuation is nakedly and undisguisedly offered as a bribe to necessitous men, without any hint of possible delay, and without a suggestion that the funds may be applied to other uses than their own immediate and pecuniary relief.

The revenues by which the Established Church is supported are mainly derived from two sources : (1) lands, (2) tithes.

(1) Lands.—The lands of the Church, except that portion which represents allotments in lieu of tithe, were indisputably bestowed by private donors. It cannot therefore be pleaded that they were, in their original donation, bestowed by the State upon the Established Church. But it is urged that their possession by the Protestant Established Church is due to a gift by the State. The argument is a stock and familiar one. The lands, which in their history unfold, as we are told (*A Talk about Tithes*, p. 7), 'an awful combination of what is as disgraceful to man as it is dishonouring to God,' were given to save souls from purgatory ; the State diverted

<sup>1</sup> *Nonconformist Independent*, November 26, 1885.

them  
which  
done  
that n  
the St  
Liber  
not id  
argum  
is used  
from U

'U  
million  
apply i  
I shall  
are our  
order t  
purgato  
'Gil  
this ?  
'Un

Again

'Gil  
now enj  
'Un  
amount  
be cons  
fully dic  
the Com  
a third c

For  
the *Par*  
*History*  
taken fr  
Henry  
of St. M  
is as fol  
to build  
to the  
(the ital  
Oliver.

Unc  
undertak  
her form  
*King'* (

them from the Roman Catholic clergy to the use of a body which does not believe in purgatory; and what the State has done once it may do again. It is unnecessary to point out that no constitutional precedent is afforded by the action of the State at the Reformation for the proceeding which the Liberation Society advocates. The two cases are not only not identical, they are not even analogous. But it is not the argument itself which we attack; it is the manner in which it is used. As an illustration we take the following passage from *Uncle Oliver on the Parson's Income*, pp. 4-6:—

'Uncle Oliver: How far may the nation *rightfully* take the six millions of money now annually devoted to Church purposes and apply it to other uses? In order to satisfy your mind on this point, I shall have briefly to explain *the history of this property* (the italics are ours). We know that in many cases property was given in order that masses might be said to get the souls of men out of purgatory.

'Gilbert: Pardon me, Uncle, but is there conclusive evidence of this?

'Uncle Oliver: Doubtless!'

Again on page 6 occurs the following passage:—

'Gilbert: But do you really think that much of the property now enjoyed by the Church had its origin in the way you describe?

'Uncle Oliver: We have no means of determining the exact amount; but . . . it is not too much to infer that the amount must be considerable. This we know, that in one way or other so skillfully did they' (the clergy) 'manage matters that in the year 1404 the Commons petitioned the King, stating that the clergy possessed a third of the whole land of the kingdom.'

For evidence of his statement Uncle Oliver relies upon the *Parochial Antiquities* of Bishop Kennet, and upon Brand's *History of Newcastle*. His first quotation purports to be taken from p. 90 of *Parochial Antiquities*: 'In the reign of Henry I., Robert of Oily and Edith his wife built the Church of St. Mary, Osney, Oxford.' The passage in Bishop Kennet is as follows: 'Robert de Oily and Edith his wife began now to build the Church of St. Maries, in the Isle of Oseney, near to the Castle of Oxford, *for the use of Augustine Monks*' (the italics are ours). The last words are omitted by Uncle Oliver.

Uncle Oliver thus continues: 'This pious work was undertaken at the motion of the wife to expiate the sins of her former unchaste life, *she having been a concubine to the King*' (the italics are ours). These last words, which are not

contained in Bishop Kennet's *Parochial Antiquities*, are inserted by Uncle Oliver.

Uncle Oliver's next quotation is as follows: 'A little further on I read, "In 1191 Walter Clifford gave a mill at Frampton, in Gloucestershire, and a meadow at Lichton, for the health of the soul of his daughter, Rosamond (the fair) Clifford, mistress of Henry I."'

This quotation is contained on p. 149 of Bishop Kennet's *Parochial Antiquities*. But the words actually used are as follows: 'Her father' (*i.e.* the father of Rosamund the Fair) 'gave to those Nuns of Godestow for the health of the soul of *Margaret his wife* and this Rosamund his daughter, &c. &c.' The words in italics are omitted by Uncle Oliver.

Both these quotations are garbled in two ways: (1) the fact that the endowment was bestowed on monastic or conventual establishments is in both cases deliberately omitted; (2) the assertion, in the first case, that Edith was a royal concubine is inserted to discredit the gift, and in the second case the name of Margaret is omitted, with the same purpose, and with the same misleading result.

Uncle Oliver's two next quotations are taken from Brand's *History of the Town and County of Newcastle-upon-Tyne*, erroneously called by Uncle Oliver 'History of Northumberland.'

The pamphleteer professes to quote one extract from page 31, another from page 32: 'In 1255 Robert Valesine gave an annual rent for the support of Tyne Bridge, and for a chaplain to pray for the souls of his father, his late wife Emma, and his own soul, in the Church of St. Thomas the Martyr.' 'Here, too, in the Chapel of St. Thomas, William Herryng founded a priest to say masses, and to pray for his soul, and all Christian souls for ever.' Neither of these so-called quotations occurs in Brand, though the first is substantially correct. The second is compounded out of two different statements of Brand's, with some remarkable additions, alterations, and omissions.

Brand is giving the history of the Chapel, not of the Church, of St. Thomas the Martyr, upon the Tyne Bridge. The first extract quotes his words, except that the pamphleteer changes the words 'Chapel of St. Thomas' into 'Church of St. Thomas.' Brand goes on to say: 'In the year 1329 William Heron founded a chantry dedicated to Saint Ann in this chapel' (of St. Thomas). He refers in a note to his authorities: 'The chauntrye of Seynt Anne in the Chapelle of Seynt Thomas upon Tyne-Bridge, etc., was founded by one

Willi  
masses  
ever. I  
worth  
the sa  
this a  
tificate  
Durha  
college  
Henry  
ments.  
fiscate  
portion  
c. 14)  
word '  
in his  
concea  
which  
seized  
pamph  
tic and  
not ass  
Church  
object  
quote t  
church  
to the  
paroch  
suppos  
acciden  
taken i

<sup>1</sup> Ex  
Ecclesia  
formerly

<sup>2</sup> It i  
arguing  
monastic  
his succ  
perty at  
the large  
of the s  
different  
(Reform  
'that the  
the King  
money a  
added th  
modern

e inserted

'A little  
a mill at  
chton, for  
(the fair)

Kenet's  
ed are as  
(the Fair)  
he soul of  
, &c. &c.'

: (1) the  
ic or con-  
omitted;  
royal con-  
cond case  
pose, and

m Brand's  
pon-Tyne,  
rthumber-

tract from  
t Valesine  
ge, and for  
late wife  
thomas the  
s, William  
ray for his

f these so-  
st is sub-  
out of two  
able addi-

not of the  
ne Bridge.  
the pam-  
mas' into  
n the year  
d to Saint  
n a note to  
ne Chapelle  
ded by one

William Heryng, as it is reported, to find a priest to say masses and to pray for his sowle and all Christian sowles for ever. Its net annual value is 4*l.* 7*s.* 5*d.* Its ornaments, etc., were worth 70*s.* 11*d.*, as doth apere by a perticular inventory of the same. Ther wer no other lands, etc.' In other words, this account is taken, as Brand points out, from the 'Certificate of Colleges and Chantries in Northumberland and Durham'—that is, from one of the lists of abbeys, priories, colleges, and chantries which were prepared in the reign of Henry VIII., with the intention of appropriating the endowments. Ultimately the property of the chantries was confiscated in the first year of Edward VI., though only a small portion was applied, as the Preamble of the Act (1 Ed. VI., c. 14) promises, 'to good and godly uses.' By altering the word 'chantry,' which Brand uses both in his statement and in his quotation, into the word 'chapel,' the pamphleteer conceals the fact that these endowments were for chantries which never belonged to the Established Church, and were seized by the Crown in the reign of Edward VI. The pamphleteer, knowing that endowments bestowed on monastic and conventual establishments or on chantry chapels will not assist his argument as to the property *now* held by the Church,<sup>1</sup> in each of these three quotations suppresses the object for which the endowment was given. He omits to quote the words which expressly state that De Oily built his church for Augustine monks, that Clifford gave his lands to the nuns of Godstow, that it was a chantry, and not a parochial church, which Herryng endowed. It is impossible to suppose that this garbling of three out of four extracts was accidental, especially when the context and the argument is taken into consideration.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Except that portion of the common fund administered by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, which consists of ecclesiastical property formerly held by episcopal and capitular bodies.

<sup>2</sup> It is impossible to minimise the importance of these misquotations by arguing that they make no substantial difference, because so much of the monastic property was bestowed upon the Church by Henry VIII. and his successors. Speed estimated the annual value of the monastic property at 171,312*l.* 4*s.* 3½*d.*: Nasmith (Tanner's *Notitia*) computed that of the larger houses at 142,914*l.* 12*s.* 9½*d.* If 30,000*l.* is added as the value of the smaller monasteries, the second estimate, though drawn from different sources, closely approximates to that of Speed. Blunt (*Reformation of the Church of England*, i. 369, fourth edition) supposes 'that the annual value of the 1130 monasteries and hospitals of which the King took possession was at the least 200,000*l.*,' and this in modern money amounts 'to the great revenue of 2,400,000*l.*' To this must be added the coin and plate, which, according to Blunt, were of the value in modern money of 1,086,883*l.* If Blunt is correct in his estimates, 'nearly

Again. Uncle Oliver gives these two quotations from Brand, as well as those from Kennet, to prove that much of the existing Church property was originally bestowed upon the Church to save souls from purgatory. The two quotations from Kennet refer to property which never belonged or was transferred to the Church. It is equally plain that this is also the case with reference to the property mentioned by Brand. Brand thus closes his history of the chapel of St. Thomas the Martyr in which was founded the chantry of St. Ann: 'This chapel was united to the hospital of St. Mary Magdalene in the beginning of the reign of James I.' Following out his reference we find that this hospital was partly an almshouse and partly a royal free grammar school. Thus Uncle Oliver not only suppresses the fact that part of the endowment which he instances was bestowed on a chantry chapel, but ignores the fact, though Brand's statement is explicit and his references are plain and distinct, that the whole of the endowments of which he was treating form no part of the existing property of the Church, but were alienated nearly three centuries ago to the support of the poor and to free education.

We understand that the author of *Uncle Oliver* is dead, and for that reason we refrain from comment on the proofs of dishonesty which we have alleged. But the pamphlet in question is one of the most elaborate of the Liberationist pamphlets, consisting of fifteen pages, printed on toned paper, each page surrounded by a neat ruled margin. What defence have the executive of the Society to make for spreading broadcast through the country a pamphlet which thus manufactures the authorities upon which it relies? Is such a practice consistent with the profession of 'a deep sense of obligation to Jesus Christ?' Is it honourable to preface this manufactured evidence with this description of Uncle Oliver: 'The old man was never so happy as when trying to remove the perplexities of youth, and especially when they arose out of an earnest desire to be just?'

Thus far we have seen that the Liberation Society, an association formed of men constrained by a deep sense of obligation to Jesus Christ, insinuates against the clergy the charge of understating their incomes, offers the property, now devoted 100,000*l.* of modern money, found its way back to the Church. The amount surrendered to the Church was therefore only a twenty-fourth part of the annual value of the monastic property. No share fell to the Church in the million of ready money seized by the Crown, or in the endowments of the chantries, which were, as Fuller says, scrambled for by the courtiers as 'the last dish of the last course,' and the purchase value of which in modern money must be reckoned by millions.

to reli  
labour  
upon  
garble  
revent

(2)  
proper  
select.  
are th

1.

wulf,

2.

reclaim

3.

four o

Of

wulf,

was m

that t

but af

tion.' 2

in En

To th

give t

Liber

as a c

to the

did fo

for M

king o

We v

terial

had to

educ

aliases

legisla

quoted

them)

land.

is pro

is unc



to religious purposes, as a naked, undisguised bribe to farmers, labourers, and taxpayers, and claims the lands of the Church upon the strength of so-called quotations which are palpably garbled. We pass on to the second source of ecclesiastical revenues, namely, Tithes.

(2) Tithes.—Tithes, says the Liberation Society, are public property alienable by the public to any public use it may select. And this for several reasons, of which the following are those which most frequently recur :—

1. Because they were granted by the State through Ethelwulf, king of Wessex ;
2. Because by the Barren Lands Act all lands subsequently reclaimed were rendered liable to tithes ;
3. Because they have been diverted from what was one of four original objects, the support of the poor.

Of these three reasons in their order. And (1) of *Ethelwulf's so-called donation*. 'The first compulsory levy of tithe was made by Ethelwulf.'<sup>1</sup> Again, 'it is generally allowed that the compulsory levy of tithes originated with Ethelwulf, but after his death they were the frequent subjects of legislation.'<sup>2</sup> Again, 'the law enforcing a general payment of tithes in England is attributed to Ethelwulf nearly a century later.' To this last statement is appended a note which professes to give the words of the so-called charter. 'Here then,' says the Liberationist champion, 'is my authority for stating that tithe, as a compulsory source of revenue, was granted by the State to the Church.'<sup>3</sup> Again, 'Uncle Oliver' says, 'King Ethelwulf did for the whole of England what Offa had previously done for Mercia,' and adds, 'every schoolboy knows that he was king of England, and not merely king of the West Saxons.'<sup>4</sup> We venture to submit that a schoolboy's knowledge is immaterial ; it would be more to the purpose if our venerable friend had told us what is known to every grown-up man of fair education. The laws of this West Saxon sovereign of many aliases certainly did not run north of the Thames. If his legislation refers to tithes of increase at all (and, if the charter quoted in *A Talk about Tithes* is genuine, it does not refer to them), the operation of his laws was limited to the south of England. But this so-called donation is of doubtful authority, and is probably a forgery. The text of this dubious document is uncertain ; three versions of it, at least, are in existence.

<sup>1</sup> *The Established Church*, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *How the Clergy are State-paid*, p. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *A Talk about Tithes*, p. 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Uncle Oliver on the Parson's Income*, pp. 10-11.

Finally, if this donation is genuine, and if the text of the charter was ascertainable, we have the authority of Dr. Stubbs, quoted in the *Case for Disestablishment*, p. 56, that it has 'nothing to do with tithes.'<sup>1</sup>

The Liberation Society has in fact abandoned this so-called donation as the original deed of gift upon which depends the legal right to tithes in England. In an Appendix (pp. 188-190) to the *Case for Disestablishment* the authority of Haddan and Stubbs is quoted for the surrender of the charter as historically untenable. But has the Society withdrawn from circulation the other publications in which the statement occurs? Has it given the same publicity to the correction which it gave to the propagation of the error? Has it done its utmost to remove the misapprehensions founded on its once mistaken, but now corrected, views of history? Or does it not still continue to distribute among the ignorant electors a statement which it has abandoned in the publication which appeals to a more intelligent class? The mistake respecting Ethelwulf's donation was corrected in the 1884 edition of the *Case for Disestablishment*. At that very time, when the Society could no longer plead ignorance in excuse, all the pamphlets from which we have quoted were still in circulation, and we challenge the Society to prove that they have ever been withdrawn.

Ethelwulf's donation explains the payment of the tithe upon land which was cultivated in the ninth century; but how comes it that the lands subsequently reduced to cultivation are subject to tithe? The Liberation Society is prepared with its answer. And so we reach the second ground for its statement that tithes were conferred by the nation upon the Church, *viz.* 2. The Barren Lands Act (2 and 3 Edward VI.).

'In Ethelwulf's time the population of the whole country was not half that of modern London. The land for the most part was barren, and for some hundreds of years afterwards it so remained. Of the 30,000,000 acres of land now under cultivation certainly more than 20,000,000 have been reclaimed from waste during the last 300 years. It has become chargeable with tithe as it has been reclaimed.'<sup>2</sup>

Again—

'In the reign of Edward VI. an Act was passed giving tithes on all lands that might be reclaimed from a state of barrenness. By this and the subsequent Enclosure Acts, nearly the whole of the tithes at present enjoyed by the clergy have been created.'<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The same conclusion, in substance, is arrived at by Lord Selborne in his recent work *Ancient Facts and Fictions concerning Churches and Tithes*, pp. 202, 206.

<sup>2</sup> *Uncle Oliver on the Parson's Income*, p. 12.

<sup>3</sup> *The Established Church*, p. 3.

Again—

'The greater portion of tithes is of modern origin, and arises from comparatively modern Acts of Parliament. One of these is what is called the Barren Lands Act of Edward VI., which gave the parochial clergy the right to levy tithes on all hitherto barren land after it had been seven years in cultivation. That is to say, persons who undertook to cultivate these lands were allowed to be free from tithe for seven years. Afterwards, the clergy were permitted to go in and seize a tenth of the fruit of their labours.'<sup>1</sup>

What is the character and what are the special words of this supremely important Act, under which, if the Liberation Society is right, nearly two-thirds of the tithe-rent charge is payable?

2 & 3 Ed. VI. c. 13 is a statute which defines and suspends, but nowhere imposes, the obligation to pay tithes. No new right to tithes is conferred. The statute re-enacts 27 Hen. VIII. c. 20 and 32 Hen. VIII. c. 7, which provide that every person 'according to the *laudable usages and customs* of the parish or other place where he dwelleth,' or 'according to the *lawful customs and usages* of the parishes or places' where the tithes or duties arise, 'shall yield and pay his tithes and other duties of holy church.' It proceeds to enact that 'every of the King's subjects' shall pay their tithe in '*such manner and form as hath been of right yielded and paid within forty years next before the making of this Act or of right and custom ought to have been paid.*' In other words, the general object of the statute is to confirm and define the common law and customary rights to tithe. Predial tithes were due of common right of any fruit of the earth which renews annually. All cultivated land was *primâ facie* subject to tithe, unless it was discharged by prescription or composition; but barren heaths or waste grounds paid no tithe, 'by reason of their barrenness.' The moment that they were improved and converted into arable or meadow ground, and thus produced fruits of the earth which were annually renewable, the common law obligation to pay tithes at once accrued. It was the policy of the legislature in the reign of Edward VI. to encourage agriculture. Consequently section v. provides that *no reclaimed lands shall be liable to pay tithes till after the expiration of seven years from their reclamation.* Yet it is on this fifth section that the Society relies.

Thus, of the 30,000,000 acres of cultivated land, upon which Uncle Oliver says that tithes are payable, the right to tithes is claimed, according to the Liberation pamphlets, on 10,000,000

<sup>1</sup> *How the Clergy are State-paid*, p. 2.

under a charter which they themselves admit to have nothing to do with tithes, and on the remaining 20,000,000 by virtue of a statute which really exempts reclaimed lands from the payment for a period of seven years. It need hardly be added that no Enclosure Act which was ever passed imposed the obligation to pay tithes.

In this case, again, it appears that the Society understands well enough the real purport of the Barren Lands Act. 'When it was thought that barren lands and woods of more than twenty years' growth ought to claim exemption from tithes, the Legislature under Edward III. and Edward VI. made laws to release from such obligation.'<sup>1</sup> To this statement is appended a note referring to '45 Ed. III. c. 3,' and '2 & 3 Ed. VI.' There can be, therefore, no doubt that the Act of Edward VI., to which the two sets of pamphlets refer, is one and the same. No other statute referring to tithe was passed in the second and third years of Edward VI., unless indeed it has disappeared from the statutes of the realm. In this last-quoted passage the purport of the Act is correctly explained, because the true meaning suits the argument. Here it is pleaded that tithes are public property because the Legislature has interfered to suspend the payment; there the argument is that the tithes are public property because the Legislature, by the same statute, imposed the obligation. One interpretation must necessarily be wrong. We may fairly ask the Society to elect upon which of these two self-contradictory arguments it prefers to stand, and to take the necessary steps to remove the misapprehensions its mistake has fostered.

It is remarkable that in the *Case for Disestablishment*, a work which, from its price, necessarily appeals to a more educated class than publications that are distributed gratis, no mention is made of the Barren Lands Act. If the pamphleteers are right, two-thirds of the land of England is subject to tithe by virtue of this Act. It is impossible, therefore, to explain the omission of all mention of this Act from the *Case for Disestablishment* by saying that the point is not discussed. Pages 54 to 56 are devoted to prove that tithes are a charge imposed by the State for the Church Establishment. If the interpretation given by the pamphlets is correct, no further proof is needed. The only possible reason why the *Case for Disestablishment* omits all mention of an Act which so satisfactorily explains how tithes came to be payable on reclaimed land, is that no educated person can interpret the Act as it is interpreted in the pamphlets. We may once more ask the

<sup>1</sup> *A Talk about Tithes.*

Society to explain the circumstance that, in pamphlets designed for the use of ignorant, inexperienced men, a meaning is repeatedly given to an Act which no ingenuity can compel it to bear, a meaning which the Society itself both directly and impliedly abandons as untenable.

The Liberation Society are not content with the assertion that tithes were granted by Ethelwulf and Edward VI.; they say (3) *that the Clergy have filched the tithes from the poor.*

'We have it on the authority of Blackstone that one of the purposes for which "tithes" were originally imposed was the relief of the poor. At first a fourth, and subsequently a third, of the entire amount was thus devoted.'<sup>1</sup>

Again—

'For many centuries tithes were devoted to three purposes : first, the support of the bishops and clergy ; secondly, the support of church fabrics ; and thirdly, the support of the poor. By slow degrees, however, the two last objects ceased to belong to the tithe system, and the clergy became possessed of the whole of the product of this onerous, unjust, and unchristian exaction.'<sup>2</sup>

Again—

'The tithes by which he [the parson] is supported were also meant in part for your support.'<sup>3</sup>

Again—

'In many of the counties there are thousands of acres which the clergy have had assigned to them in exchange for tithes. When the Disestablishment of the Church takes place all this land will come into the possession of the nation. As it was for the most part assigned to the clergy in lieu of tithes, which were meant in part for the benefit of the poor, the poor will have a just claim to such a settlement of the question as will dispose of the land to their advantage.'<sup>4</sup>

Again—

'It is as well to say, also, that the revenues derived from tithes were, for a long period, similarly appropriated—one part being given to the clergy, another to the poor, and a third to the repairs of the churches. With us, however, the clergy have monopolized the whole, and the nation is burdened with additional charges for the churches and the poor.'<sup>5</sup>

Again—'in all the early laws about tithes, it is clearly laid down that the poor were to have a share of the tithes, and as good a share as the clergy.' The writer then states that first

<sup>1</sup> *What should be done with the Tithes*, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *The Established Church*, p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> *A Word to Agricultural Labourers*.

<sup>4</sup> *Glebe Lands and Allotments*. <sup>5</sup> *A Talk about Tithes*, p. 6.

the fourfold, and then the threefold, division of this prevailed, in both of which the poor had their share; that 'this was before the time of Parliaments; but, when Parliament made laws upon the subject, the right of the poor to their share was preserved;' that, finally, 'nobody seems to know exactly how, or when, the poor lost their legal claim to a share of the tithes,' although 'in Queen Elizabeth's time the old law still held good. It is quite clear, then, that the poor were meant to have a share of the tithe. . . . But the clergy have the tithes now, and so long as the Church remains established they will keep them.'<sup>1</sup>

It is of course possible that, before the formation of parishes, and before the appropriation of tithes as parochial endowments, tithes *may* have been divided into three or four parts, one of which was set aside for the poor. But no evidence exists that a fourfold division was ever known in this country, or that a threefold partition was ever practised. The only historical ground for the assertion of the Liberation pamphleteers is the existence of three manuscript collections of miscellaneous canons, and of a set of constitutions attributed to the last years of Ethelred the Unready. The first collection is put together from Irish and from African and other foreign sources; the second is conjectured to contain a rule on the Benedictine model; the third is supposed to contain canons which the compiler desired an individual bishop to adopt in his diocese. There is no proof that the canons were ever adopted, or that the constitutions were ever acted upon.<sup>2</sup> As to Blackstone's authority in the passage quoted in the Appendix to the *Case for Disestablishment* (p. 190), it is abundantly plain that he there speaks of Charlemagne's quadripartite division, and that he does not, even indirectly, suggest that the same practice ever prevailed in England. The remainder of the statements in *Tithes and the Poor* are purely fictitious. The facts are so easily ascertainable that it is difficult to avoid condemning, in the strongest possible terms, the pamphleteer's attempt to delude ignorant and inexperienced electors. Will the Liberation Society inform us, for instance, when Parliament, after 'the time of Parliaments,' made laws upon the subject of the poor enjoying 'as good a share' of the tithes as the parochial clergy, or what 'old law' still held good in Queen Elizabeth's time preserving the legal right of the poor to a share in the tithe?

<sup>1</sup> *Tithes and the Poor*.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Selborne's recent work, already quoted, and published since these pages were in type, leaves nothing more to be said on this point.



The Liberation Society will probably admit that the charge of robbing the poor is an unpleasant accusation to make against any class of persons, and especially against the parochial clergy. So odious a charge should be publicly made, or not at all. Yet it is significant to find that the confident statements of the pamphleteer do not appear in the *Case for Disestablishment*, where the object of tithes is discussed on pages 57 and 58, and in Appendix, p. 190. The omission, therefore, of such points as parliamentary legislation preserving the share of the poor in tithes, or 'the old law' which prevailed in the reign of Elizabeth, can only be explained in one way. The Society dares not place before the educated classes the arguments which it does not scruple to plead before the ignorant and the inexperienced. In the last edition of the *Case for Disestablishment*, p. 57, the Society relies almost exclusively upon an article by the Rev. Edwin Hatch (*Contemporary Review* for September 1883), which mainly deals with the legislation of Charles the Great on the subject of tithes, and which produces no evidence that the Continental practice ever prevailed in this country. The responsible writer makes no unfounded statements, and directs against the clergy no unsubstantiated charges. It is natural that the language of publications which are 'specially written,' to use the significant language of the Society's Report for 1885, 'for the new voters in the rural districts' should be plain and simple. But it is even more necessary that a class of publications prepared for ignorant rural electors should be scrupulously straightforward and accurate in statement.

We pass from the consideration of '*how the State Church is supported*' to the second head of inquiry—

## II. *What the State Church costs.*

In 1877 a work was prepared for the Liberation Society by Mr. Martin on 'The Property and Revenues of the English Church Establishment.' The annual value of the property is there estimated as follows:—

'Annual income of two archbishops and 28 bishops	£163,300
Value of 33 episcopal palaces	13,200
Income of 27 chapters of deans and canons	123,194
Value of deaneries and incomes of collegiate chapters	56,806
Incomes of the parochial clergy	4,277,060
Value of glebe-houses	750,000
Total	<u>£5,383,560</u>

In this estimate,' adds Mr. Martin, 'no account is taken of extra cathedral revenues, nor of the disbursements of Queen Anne's Bounty, nor, either, of the surplus income of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the aggregate of all which cannot be under three-quarters of a million sterling.'

If this addition of 750,000*l.* is made, the annual value of the property amounts to 6,133,560*l.*

The *Case for Disestablishment* notices that 'Mr. Martin's estimate includes incomes derived from recent endowments which, for the most part, have been provided from private sources' (p. 64). It goes on, however, to say that this qualification is nearly neutralized by the consideration that 'the estimate is based upon the figures in the *Clergy List*, which it is believed takes no account of fees and pew rents, and understates the value of the livings to the extent of from ten to twenty per cent.'

With these qualifications, and with the addition of 2,000,000*l.* as the annual value of cathedrals and churches, the *Case for Disestablishment* must be taken to accept Mr. Martin's estimate prepared for the Liberation Society in 1877. In the pamphlets circulated side by side with the *Case for Disestablishment* a different calculation is put forward. The cost of the Establishment is thus summarized on pages 10-11 of the *Established Church* :—

'Archbishops and bishops . . . .	£158,000
Cathedrals (about) . . . .	350,000
Parochial benefices . . . .	4,500,000
Parliamentary and other grants . . . .	100,000
Ecclesiastical Commission (net) . . . .	700,000
Queen Anne's Bounty (net) . . . .	130,000
Total . . . .	<u>£5,938,000</u>

The sum total represents an income of nearly six millions sterling.'

Thus the *Established Church* estimates the annual income at 5,938,000*l.*, and Mr. Martin at 6,133,560*l.* if the Ecclesiastical Commission, extra-cathedral revenues (whatever these may be), and Queen Anne's Bounty are added to his valuation. These two estimates are so near that we should not cavil at so slight a discrepancy as 200,000*l.* But it is to be noticed that Mr. Martin estimates the total annual value of Church property, while the computation in the *Established Church* only calculates the actual income. Consequently Mr. Martin includes in his estimate

Both  
this p  
Chur  
Mr. M  
763,2  
Chur

T  
and c  
still r  
is, ro  
incom  
cath  
siastic  
lation  
eman

TI  
tinues  
the p  
in Eng  
has to  
bishop  
parson

'E  
D  
C  
C  
Pa

The fo

That is  
manner  
than te

Wi  
estima  
served  
that (i  
in all—

- (1) The value of 33 episcopal palaces . . . £13,200  
 (2) The value of glebe houses . . . 750,000

Both these items are omitted in the *Established Church* from this portion of the account. How, then, does the *Established Church* make its estimate square within 200,000*l.* with that of Mr. Martin if it omits to take into consideration a sum of 763,200*l.*? In other words, whence does the *Established Church* derive this additional sum of 563,200*l.*?

The *Established Church* gives a new item—parliamentary and other grants—which it estimates at 100,000*l.*; but there still remains a difference of more than 450,000*l.* This sum is, roughly speaking, made up by adding 230,000*l.* to the incomes of the parochial clergy, 170,000*l.* to the incomes of cathedrals, and 60,000*l.* to Mr. Martin's estimate of the Ecclesiastical Commission and Queen Anne's Bounty. Both calculations are, it is to be observed, circulated side by side, and emanate from the same Society.

This sum of six millions sterling 'does not, however,' continues the *Established Church*, 'represent more than half of the pecuniary benefit which the Episcopalian denomination in England derives from its connexion with the State. There has to be added to it the annual value of the deaneries, bishops' palaces, the cathedrals, the church edifices, and the parsonages.' These items are thus valued:—

'Episcopal palaces . . . . .	£12,000
Deaneries . . . . .	2,000
Cathedrals . . . . .	232,000
Church edifices . . . . .	3,840,000
Parsonages . . . . .	860,000
Total . . . . .	<u>£4,946,000</u>

The following is the sum total:—

Ordinary revenue . . . . .	£5,938,000
Use of buildings . . . . .	4,946,400
Total (say) . . . . .	<u>£10,884,400</u>

That is to say, the *Established Church* is in the enjoyment, in one manner or another, of national property of the annual value of more than ten millions sterling.'

Without criticizing the items in detail, or impugning this estimate on grounds which are open to dispute, it is to be observed that in this calculation no notice is taken of the facts that (i.) pew-rents and fees are included—in many cases if not in all—in the returns of figures made to the *Clergy List*; (ii.)

the surplus and unincumbered income of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners is expended on the augmentation of poor livings, and that these augmentations are included in the figures of the *Clergy List*; (iii.) the augmentations made by Queen Anne's Bounty, so far as it is a grant office, are also included in the figures of the *Clergy List*; (iv.) the augmentations made by both the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and Queen Anne's Bounty are met by private benefactions, which are also included in the *Clergy List* figures; (v.) many of the churches valued in the above estimate have been built, wholly or in part, by means of voluntary subscriptions. In other words, this calculation in the *Established Church*, which estimates the annual value of the national property enjoyed by the Church at 10,884,400*l.*, counts the income of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and of Queen Anne's Bounty twice over, and includes in public money modern private endowments and sources of revenue which can under no circumstance be considered as public money.

In most of the pamphlets the gross yearly revenues of the Established Church are estimated at six millions sterling; that is to say, the figures contained in the first part of the estimate in the *Established Church* are generally accepted. 'The gross yearly revenues of the Established Church amount to about six millions sterling, probably more.'<sup>1</sup> 'The total capital value of Church property is not less than two hundred millions.'<sup>2</sup> 'The revenues of the clergy are being increased every year by the Ecclesiastical Commission and Queen Anne's Bounty, both bodies having been established by Act of Parliament for that purpose. The ordinary revenue of the Ecclesiastical Commission is about a million sterling, and that of Queen Anne's Bounty about 130,000*l.*'<sup>3</sup> Again, 'How far,' asks Uncle Oliver, 'may the nation rightfully take away the six millions of money now annually devoted to Church purposes, and apply it to other uses?'<sup>4</sup>

The *Case for Disestablishment* (pp. 64, 65) prints, and implicitly approves, Mr. Arthur Arnold's estimate of the value of Church property which appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* for April, 1878. Mr. Arnold calculates the 'amount of the fund at the disposal of the State in the event of disendowment' at 7,502,602*l.* This calculation exceeds that of Mr. Martin by more than two millions; yet Mr. Arnold accepts several of his figures. The difference between them arises upon three items of account:—

<sup>1</sup> *What the State Church Costs*, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Uncle Oliver on the Parson's Income*, p. 4.

(a) Queen Anne's Bounty and Ecclesiastical Commission	£750,000
(b) Property omitted from New Domesday Book.	361,860
(c) Excess on income of Parochial Clergy	1,120,000
Total	£2,231,860

Neither Mr. Martin nor Mr. Arnold take into account the assumed annual value of cathedrals and churches throughout the country. The *Case for Disestablishment* therefore adds 2,000,000*l.* to Mr. Arnold's estimate on this heading. It will be remembered that the pamphlets of the Society valued this item of account at 4,072,000*l.*, or allowed more than as much again as the *Case for Disestablishment*.

Before passing on to a comparison of the estimates of Mr. Arnold, Mr. Martin, and the pamphlets, it will be well to call attention to Mr. Arnold's excessive valuation of the tithe. Mr. Arnold values the tithe rent-charge at 5,000,000*l.*; and the *Case for Disestablishment* (p. 65) impliedly accepts this valuation by adding 2,000,000*l.* to his figures as the value of ecclesiastical edifices, and thus concluding its paragraph upon the 'value of property devoted to Church purposes,' 'making the necessary additions to Mr. Arnold's totals above given, the result is reached that the Church of England is annually subsidized out of public property to the extent of 9,500,000*l.*' On page 59 of the *Case for Disestablishment* the Tithe Report of the Land Commissioners for 1883 is quoted, from which it appears that the total amount of the commuted tithe rent-charge, including that apportioned to lay appropriators and schools, colleges, &c., is only 4,053,985*l.* 6*s.* 8½*d.* In other words, the *Case for Disestablishment* accepts a valuation of the tithe which, on its own showing, is exaggerated by upwards of 1,750,000*l.* It is the more remarkable that the *Case for Disestablishment* should have adopted Mr. Arnold's figures, because in the *Liberator*, the monthly organ of the Liberation Society, occurs the following criticism of the article in which they were originally contained: 'Mr. Arnold has certainly not studied this aspect of the question with sufficient care, for he has placed the annual value of tithes at 5,000,000*l.*, when it is well known that the value received by the parochial clergy is scarcely one-half that amount.' If this was well known to the Society we feel justified in asking, how does it happen that the Society accepts a valuation which it so clearly repudiated, and which exceeds what it knows to be the real amount by nearly one-half?

It may prove convenient to place side by side the three estimates which we have discussed:—

- (1) Mr. Martin, 5,383,560*l.*, quoted in *Case for Disestablishment*.
- (2) Mr. Arnold, 7,502,602*l.*, quoted in *Case from Nineteenth Century*.
- (3) The pamphlets, designed for 'rural electors,' 10,884,400*l.*

Of this enormous estimate no notice is taken in the *Case for Disestablishment*. It will also be observed (1) that even if 2,000,000*l.* is added on to Mr. Martin's estimate the pamphlets give a calculation of Church property which exceeds the valuation prepared for the Liberation Society by 3,490,840*l.*; (2) that if the same addition is made to Mr. Arnold's estimate, though the *Case* itself admits that valuation to be exaggerated by nearly two millions, the estimate of the pamphlets designed for rural electors is still the highest by 1,381,798*l.*

Will the Society explain why the estimate put forward for ignorant, inexperienced electors exceeds that prepared for the Society itself by 5½ millions of money, or that offered to the intelligent classes by nearly 3½ millions? Or why, in the second place, does the Society, in the publication prepared for sale, abandon and ignore the estimate drawn up for, and gratuitously circulated among, 'rural electors'? Or why, in the third place, does the result reached in the *Case for Disestablishment*, though based on an estimate which is on its own showing excessive by nearly two millions, fall short of the result attained in the pamphlets by 1,300,000*l.*?

If the three estimates of the different items of account are arranged in parallel columns, the discrepancies appear somewhat remarkable. The comparison is instituted only upon the common items of account. Thus there must be added to Mr. Arnold's account 382,860*l.* for 'Churchwardens' Lands' and 'Property omitted from the New Domesday Book,' and to the account in the pamphlets 100,000*l.* for 'Parliamentary and other Grants.'

	(1) Mr. Martin	(2) Mr. Arnold	(3) Pamphlets
	£	£	£
(1) Income of Higher Clergy, including value of their residences	356,500	239,742	522,000
(2) Tithes and Glebes	4,277,060	5,400,000	4,500,000
(3) Value of Glebe Houses	750,000	750,000	860,000
(4) Ecclesiastical Commission	—	700,000	700,000
(5) Queen Anne's Bounty	—	30,000	130,000
(6) Value of Ecclesiastical Edifices	2,000,000 <sup>1</sup>	2,000,000 <sup>1</sup>	4,072,000
Total	7,383,560	9,119,742	10,784,000

<sup>1</sup> This figure of 2,000,000*l.* is supplied to both Mr. Arnold and Mr. Martin by the *Case for Disestablishment*, p. 65.



In every case, except in that of Mr. Arnold's erroneous estimate of the tithe, it will be observed that the items of the estimates prepared for the rural electors exceed those to which the Society gives its more responsible sanction. Yet both sets of estimates are prepared by and for the Society, and both are issued with its *imprimatur*. Between the highest and lowest figures in the three estimates adopted by the Liberation Society, there is

On the 1st item of account a discrepancy of	£ 282,258
On the 2nd " " "	1,127,000
On the 3rd " " "	110,000
On the 5th " " "	100,000
On the 6th " " "	2,072,000

Total amount of difference between the highest and lowest estimates adopted by the Society in five items of account . . . 3,691,258

Even those who shrink from the conclusion we feel ourselves constrained to draw from the difference between the estimates in the pamphlets and those in the *Case for Disestablishment* cannot for one moment contend that such divergent valuations possess any statistical importance.

We pass on to the third and last head of inquiry—

### III. *The Relations of the Parochial Clergy towards their Parishioners.*

'Such is the spirit of bitter sectarianism which often prevails, that sites for chapels are refused, and all the arts of petty persecution are employed to put a stop to religious services in other buildings. It is notorious that this is done continually; and it is indirectly the result of the parochial system.'<sup>1</sup>

Again—

'It is not rare, unfortunately, for men in holy orders to play the oppressor in rural districts. In guarding their priestly pretensions most of them are harsh, inconsiderate, intolerant, intolerable. The squire, the squire's wife, the squire's daughters are persuaded to become agents of petty persecution. In fact, all the machinery of social oppression is brought to bear upon any of the poorer parishioners who dare to have and to express a faith in their own responsibility.'<sup>2</sup>

Again—

The Established Church 'in the rural districts too often strives to bend the poor into submission to its authority by acts of petty persecution which are a discredit to the Church and to the age.'<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The Practical Working of the Parochial System*, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *The Church in the Villages.*

<sup>3</sup> *Modern Persecution.*

Again—

'The impression left upon the mind of the class' (agricultural labourers) 'by the conduct of the clergy (liberal in their charity as many of them are) is not one of veneration, of affection, or of gratitude, but of dread, dislike, and, too commonly, of hate.'<sup>1</sup>

Again—

'For nothing does the Church deserve a more severe condemnation than for its long neglect of you, and the helpless, hopeless misery in which it has allowed so many of your number to live, generation after generation. The Established Church is not alone to blame, but to it belongs the chief discredit. You hear a great deal of Church charities now that the Church wants your votes.'<sup>2</sup>

Again—

'One of the arguments often used in favour of the Established Church is that it is the poor man's friend in matters of education. Is that true? No, certainly not.'<sup>3</sup>

Again—

'Churchmen call their schools voluntary schools, as if they paid for them altogether out of their own pockets. In reality they are largely supported out of the taxes. In 1884 they cost the country no less than 1,418,242*l.*; and since 1839 the Established Church has received close upon twenty-two millions of public money for their so-called public schools.'<sup>4</sup>

Again—

'It is admitted that the clergy lose much of their moral influence over the masses from their political alliance with the party of privilege and property.'<sup>5</sup>

For this last statement the Society quotes the authority of a speech made by Canon MacColl at the Newcastle Congress. It unaccountably omits to mention that the Canon began his paper with the statement that he assumed the position of an advocate for Disestablishment *for the purpose of promoting discussion*. We do not propose to enter on a criticism of controverted points raised in these pamphlets. It is again the manner in which the arguments are used that we here condemn. As to the charge of persecution, let us quote the words of Dr. Maclaren, in whose lecture on *Religious Equality* (published by the Liberation Society) the Noncon-

<sup>1</sup> *The Church in the Villages*.

<sup>2</sup> *What has it done for you? A Word to Agricultural Labourers*.

<sup>3</sup> *The Established Church and the Education of the People*. <sup>4</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>5</sup> *Pamphlet on Mr. Richards' Motion for the Disestablishment of the Church of England*.

formist argument is as eloquently pleaded as it is impartially stated. The churchman 'regards Salem Chapel as the haunt of unauthorized poachers;' the dissenter 'is apt to regard St. Simon's as the House of Rimmon. The two cannot unite in giving blankets. Widow Jones shall have no Church soup, not a drop, if she goes to chapel; Widow Smith shall have no chapel coals, be her bones ever so cold, if she goes to church.'<sup>1</sup> On the evidence of Dr. Maclaren, therefore, it is useless for the pot to call the kettle black. But the pamphlets designed for circulation among the less educated classes use different language to that of Dr. Maclaren. Here the clergyman is held up to execration as an intolerable oppressor, a petty persecutor, the instigator of landlord's tyrannies, commonly and deservedly the object of dread, dislike, and hate to the agricultural labourer; a man who is mainly responsible for 'the helpless, hopeless misery' of the rural poor; a man who only distributes charity that he may win votes; a man who, professing to befriend the cause of education, advertizes his self-denial at the cost of the State. It is impossible to suppose that the writer of the passage referring to educational grants was not fully aware that the Established Church, as such, has never received a farthing of public money for the support of Church schools.

Let us, in conclusion, sum up the results of our examination into the published statements of the Liberation Society. It must be borne in mind that our quotations have been made in a very limited field, and are only selected out of an abundance of evidence to illustrate the three points we proposed for discussion. The features to which we call attention are characteristic.

The Liberation Society is a wealthy association that offers a public guarantee of good faith by protestations of the deep sense of religious obligations by which its members are actuated. Yet we find that this Society as a fact issues two sets of pamphlets, one calculated to mislead rural electors, the other to support a claim to carry on the movement openly and in the light of day. It assures churchmen that its programme of disendowment is put forward in the interests of public discussion, while it offers the proceeds of the plunder, which the most complete adoption of that programme will not suffice to produce, to ignorant, inexperienced, necessitous men who are for the first time exercising the franchise. It insinuates against the clergy the charge of understating their

<sup>1</sup> *Religious Equality*, p. 7.

incomes in the direction of their interests; it accuses them of diverting to their own pockets the property of the poor whose guardians they profess to be, upon evidence which it does not venture to place before the educated classes; it seeks to embitter hostility against them by holding them up to public odium as oppressors, persecutors, instigators of petty tyranny, interested administrators of charity, assertors of false claims to befriend the poor. It offers the property of the Church as an open bribe to taxpayers, farmers, and labourers; it continues, in its appeals to the ignorant, to base its claim to tithes, partly upon a document which, in its publication for the educated, it abandons as unauthenticated, partly upon a statute which, on its own confession, will not bear the interpretation, and which it refuses to plead before the more intelligent classes. It asserts a title to the lands of the Church on the strength of quotations, which are professedly taken from historical records, but which are palpably garbled to serve a purpose. It whets the appetite for public plunder by an estimate of the revenues of the Church which is extravagant by its own confession, but which, under the cover of more moderate valuations, it dangles before the eyes of the rural electors. Finally it has expended thousands of pounds to carry a measure for which it has thus prepared the ground.

The publications upon which we have framed our indictment bear the *imprimatur* of the Society. For their contents every member of the association is responsible; but we altogether refuse to believe that the mass even of its members, much less our Nonconformist opponents, are aware of the character of the arguments which it uses in their cause. We conclude, as we began, by disclaiming all desire to embitter the controversy. Yet two questions are irresistibly suggested by the examination of these publications. Can our honourable antagonists reconcile with their honour the continued association with a Society which thus disgraces their cause by its tactics? And, secondly, what is the residuum of real worth which must be conceded to petitions and addresses for Disestablishment and Disendowment, when these manifestations of opinion are to a great extent evoked by the printed publications from which we have quoted, and by the still more heated utterances, if we may for once argue from analogy, of the hired agents of the Liberation Society?

1. 2

2. 1

OF  
 Chri  
 of R  
 this  
 are n  
 the  
 facts  
 huma  
 beca  
 rienc  
 expe  
 are s  
 ment  
 to re  
 borat  
 accep  
 natur  
 phycy  
 mitter  
 predic  
 occur  
 manif  
 requir  
 delive  
 writte  
 on by  
 eviden  
 ing th  
 of test  
 which  
 for the

# ART. V.—THE MESSIAH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah.* By VINCENT HENRY STANTON, M.A., Fellow, Tutor, and Divinity Lecturer of Trinity College, Cambridge; late Hulsean Lecturer. (Edinburgh, 1886.)
2. *Messianic Prophecy.* By CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D., Davenport Professor of Hebrew and the Cognate Languages in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City. (Edinburgh, 1886.)

OF the two great classes of supernatural facts on which Christian apologists rely as furnishing evidence of the truth of Revelation—Miracle, namely, and Prophecy—the latter has this marked advantage over the former, that in using it we are not embarrassed by any special difficulty on the ground of the fallibility of the human testimony on which the alleged facts rest. Everyone knows how Hume has argued that ‘no human testimony can have such force as to prove a miracle,’ because (as Paley concisely puts it) ‘it is contrary to experience that a miracle should be true, and not contrary to experience that testimony should be false.’ And though we are satisfied (most of us) that Hume has overstrained his argument, he carries us with him so far as this, that we feel bound to require testimony of more than usual strength, and corroboration of accompanying or resulting circumstances, before accepting as true an alleged occurrence outside the course of nature, such as we denote by the word ‘miracle.’ But in prophecy we encounter no hindrance of this sort; the facts submitted to us are, on the one hand, the previous utterance of a prediction or predictions, on the other hand, the subsequent occurrence of certain events—and then, a correspondence manifesting itself between the predictions and the events. It requires no special weight of testimony to prove the prior delivery of the predictions; they are usually in the shape of written documents (as in the case of all the prophecies relied on by the Christian Church), and require exactly the same evidence of genuineness and date as any other writings claiming the like antiquity. It requires, again, no special weight of testimony to establish the after-occurrence of the events which appear to correspond with the predictions; they are for the most part natural events, often admitted historical

facts, or at least facts in themselves quite credible. It is with regard to the correspondence between the prediction and the event, in the claim of the latter to be the fulfilment of the former, that the question of the supernatural comes in—the question, Is it a real fulfilment, or fanciful? If real, is it to be accounted for by chance coincidence or human foresight, or by divine illumination of human faculties? And the decision of these questions is, in each case, to be arrived at, not on the grounds of weight of testimony, but of internal probability, estimated by the reason according to the extent, degree, and nature of the correspondence alleged.

Now, as regards Messianic Prophecy in particular, there is no serious difficulty as to the date of the predictions relied on; for no critic has disputed, or can dispute, the fact that all the prophecies of the Old Testament were written several generations before the Christian era: and accordingly, writers on Christian evidences, in dealing with the department of prophecy, have devoted themselves largely to the collection of passages of Messianic import, such, namely, as foreshow, or seem to foreshow, the facts of the Life and Work of the Lord Jesus. In this pursuit they have been under a temptation, to which it must be owned they have not seldom yielded, of exaggerating the completeness of the correspondence discoverable, of adducing far-fetched and precarious instances of it, of detecting coincidences that are unreal, and of attributing to real ones an exactness and particularity greater than can be fairly claimed for them. Such exaggerations have unavoidably tended to discredit the argument from prophecy; its dignity is lowered and its cogency weakened by the dwelling on petty, and not seldom questionable, details; which, moreover, if too prominently put forward, serve to draw away the eyes from the larger and strongly marked outlines in which the person, character, and offices of the coming One are indicated in the prophetic pages of the Old Testament, whether by direct prediction or by typical prefigurement in the lives of its historic personages. And in due time the position thus rashly taken up by over-zealous advocates has provoked attack. Its weakness was detected by the acuteness of Strauss, who had no difficulty in proving it to be as available for the assailant as for the defender of the Christian faith. It was impossible (he knew) to overthrow the argument from prophecy by proving the predictions to have been invented to suit the facts; why may not the facts (he asked) have been imagined to suit the predictions? And accordingly he proposed by his Mythical Theory not only to dispose of the argument that

the C  
fulfil  
as a  
an as  
into  
Mess  
ment  
T  
Testa  
now r  
or pas  
the ar  
forced  
charac  
estima  
Messia  
influen  
apprec  
fulness  
dispute  
of the  
in its p  
Messia  
were th  
in the m  
were gi  
exist in  
time wh  
Tow  
tion is n  
head of  
directly  
remote  
of New  
Anglica  
expect t  
in teach  
have thu  
common  
themselv  
attempt  
free inqu  
position  
research.



the Gospel was from God because the Life of Jesus was the fulfilment of ancient prophecy, but to get rid of that Life even as a narrative of historic fact, and to resolve the Gospels into an assemblage of myths which 'originated in a transference into the history of Jesus of the Jewish expectations of the Messiah,' those expectations being grounded on 'the Old Testament prophecies and types and their current interpretations.'<sup>1</sup>

Thus the question of the correspondence between the Old Testament predictions and the New Testament narratives is now no longer one which the Christian advocate may take up, or pass by, according as he feels disposed to use or not use the argument from the fulfilment of Messianic prophecy; it is forced upon him as part of the great question of the historical character of the Gospels. This being so, it follows that an estimate of the value of any new work treating of the Messianic character of the Old Testament must be largely influenced by the extent to which the author proves that he appreciates the vital importance of the issue involved, and the fulness of the light he succeeds in throwing on the matters in dispute—the problems, namely, What are the extent and nature of the intimations given by Old Testament prophecy, whether in its predictive or in its typical form, of the coming of the Messiah—His attributes, His life, and His work? How far were they capable of engendering an adequate Messianic idea in the mind of the nation to whom the Messianic prophecies were given? To what extent, and in what form, did that idea exist in the mind of that nation at or shortly before the time when Jesus was born in Bethlehem?

Towards the solution of these problems material contribution is made by each of the books whose titles stand at the head of this article; in the former directly, in the latter indirectly, yet effectually. Coming as they do from widely remote quarters—this from the Union Theological Seminary of New York, that from one of the twin ancient homes of Anglican theology in the mother country—we naturally expect to find them no less widely removed from one another in teaching as well as in form. Yet, unlike as they are, they have thus much in common in their mode of dealing with their common subject of Messianic Prophecy—that both address themselves fairly to that subject as it now stands, with no attempt to ignore the results which modern criticism and free inquiry claim to have attained in altering its aspect or position by the force of new methods and the light of fresh research. Each work represents an honest and able endeavour

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Jesus* (1864), sec. 25.

to face the questions, How far do these results bear on the revelations of the New Testament? Do they touch the substance of the faith of the Church? Is there anything we must give up—and how much is there left us—of the cherished and familiar teaching that traced out the Person, the Life, and the Offices of the Lord Jesus, foreshown in the Messiah 'of whom Moses in the Law, and the Prophets, did write'?

But in nearly every other point of view the relation between these books is one of contrast and not of resemblance. With Mr. Stanton the main problem to be solved is an historical one—What, in point of fact, was the conception which the Jewish mind had formed for itself at, or before, the Christian era, of the Messiah whose coming the Jewish Scriptures foreshadowed? Dr. Briggs, on the other hand, seeks to offer his readers a complete exegetical survey of the whole range of Old Testament prophecy; a determination of the import borne by each several Messianic prediction in the mind of him who first uttered it and of those who first heard it, and further of the fuller import latent in it till brought to light and quickened into life in the Gospel of Jesus. Both writers, as we have said, give fair and ample—we might add, more than ample—weight to the new elements alleged to have been introduced into Biblical study by the higher criticism and philology; each has gone to the utmost limits in the way of concession to those who deal with the Scriptures as with any other ancient writings, and who hold that they can be dealt with intelligibly only on the assumption that there is nothing supernatural either in their origin or in their substance. But each has his own way of conceding; and their ways are so completely different as to involve a marked dissimilarity of attitude towards the adversary, as well as of tone. Even as regards the extent of ground common to the two books, these differences of method make themselves felt as a limiting cause. Whole regions of inquiry are excluded from the plan of Mr. Stanton's treatise which occupy a large and prominent place in that of Dr. Briggs: for the former is usually content to decline to use the evidence of predictions of the Old Testament whose date, or interpretation, are disputed; while the latter has industriously endeavoured to add to the interest and completeness of his work by retranslations (not always, we must remark, altogether successful) of nearly all the Messianic passages used by him in its course, sufficiently furnished with critical notes. But, on the other hand, the range of *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*, though thus narrower than that of *Messianic Prophecy*, so far as it lies within the bounds

188  
of  
imp  
liter  
has  
pres  
min  
Test  
be o  
certa  
stud  
of th  
Apo  
appe  
the I  
T  
subje  
it, rec  
proce  
plan  
them,  
both  
witness  
the G  
TH  
for his  
or on t  
the his  
and to  
plan w  
thus la  
and fo  
satisfac  
produc  
vivid p  
industr  
research  
ties, if  
worthy  
readabl  
its solid  
content  
of his a  
*Esdras*  
1 The  
2 Esdras

of the Old Testament canon, is proportionately wider in the important and less known regions of Jewish non-canonical literature. Dr. Briggs, as we learn from his Preface (p. ix), has considered it superfluous to seek in that literature for expressions of the Messianic idea as conceived in the Jewish mind, because that idea 'is complete in the canon of the Old Testament.' But we believe that Mr. Stanton's readers will be of opinion that not the least valuable parts of his work—certainly the most suggestive as opening up new lines of study—are those in which he collects the traits of the aspect of the expected Messiah as shown in the early Rabbinic, Apocalyptic, and other pseudepigraphic Jewish writings which appear to belong to the period shortly before or shortly after the Incarnation of our Lord.

Two works which, though dealing with the same high subject, have so little in common in their manner of treating it, require to be considered severally as well as together. We proceed, therefore, to give some further description of the plan and contents, the merits and defects, of each, examining them, however, mainly with a view to the great question which both alike deal with—What are the nature and extent of the witness borne by the Law and the Prophets to the Christ of the Gospels?

The claim which, in his Preface (p. viii), Mr. Stanton makes for his treatise, that it is 'the first attempt, either in England or on the Continent, to examine systematically and thoroughly the historical relations of Christian Messianic beliefs to Jewish, and to appreciate their significance,' defines sufficiently the plan which he has proposed to himself in it. To the lines thus laid down he has confined himself with scrupulous rigour, and following them he has done his work with laborious and satisfactory thoroughness. He has not, indeed, succeeded in producing—apparently he has not attempted to produce—a vivid presentation of the Messiah of Jewish expectation; his industrious method of simply reproducing the results of his researches in the form of citation and analysis of his authorities, if it makes his book less attractive, makes it more trustworthy. Yet we think he might have improved it in point of readableness and literary form, without sensibly diminishing its solid usefulness to the theological student, if he had been content to curtail considerably the somewhat tedious fulness of his account of the *Book of Enoch* and of the *Apocalypses of Esdras* and *Baruch*.<sup>1</sup> The value of these writings as a part,

<sup>1</sup> The *Apocalypse of Esdras* is the book commonly known as the 2 Esdras of the Apocrypha of the English Bible, and the 4 Esdras of the

hitherto not sufficiently known or weighed, of the evidence bearing on the Messianic expectations which existed among the Jews of the later pre-Christian times, we have already admitted. We agree with Mr. Stanton in the opinion (p. 39) that these writings, however little esteemed in the Rabbinic schools, are important, inasmuch as they 'reveal prevalent opinions and the yearnings of the heart of the people' concerning the expected Redeemer of Israel; and we are satisfied that he has not over-estimated the weight of the evidence on which a pre-Christian date has been assigned to part at least of the first of the apocalyptic books we have named, to a smaller but not insignificant part of the *Sibylline Oracles*, and to the whole of the very interesting collection, in which the King Messiah is set forth as the supreme object of the desire of Israel, known as the *Psalms of Solomon*. And the distinct testimony which these books yield to the prevalence, in at least some quarters of the Jewish world, of the Messianic hope in the age to which they belong, is all the more welcome by reason of the contrast they present in this respect to the absence of all definite expression of that hope from the books commonly known as the Apocrypha.<sup>1</sup> But it appears to us that in his treatment of this part of his subject Mr. Stanton has allowed himself to be drawn by the attraction of a novel line of study into unnecessary and disproportionate amplitude of detail. A more skilful writer would have known how to bring out and arrange the salient points of his results so as to impress his reader's memory, instead of burdening it with the particulars of successive visions and discussions of chronological indications. His treatise, though it is little more than an amplification and development of the third chapter of Dr. Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, has failed to attain anything of the admirable conciseness and lucid order of which that excellent work is so signal an example. And it is to be added that the same deficiency of literary skill shows

Vulgate (which the English version represents). It is not properly classed under the title Apocrypha, not being extant in Greek; but it is found in various languages—notably in Syriac, in the oldest existing manuscript of the Peshitto Old Testament (B. 21, *inf.*), preserved in the Ambrosian Library of Milan. This manuscript contains, also, the only known copy of the *Apocalypse of Baruch*; but a portion of it, under the name of the First Epistle of Baruch, is commonly found in manuscripts of the Peshitto Old Testament (as in the Bodleian, Poc. 391 and Or. 141), and is given in Walton's *Polyglot*.

<sup>1</sup> It may, perhaps, be conjectured that the silence of the books called Apocrypha on this topic is due in some measure to influences prevalent at Alexandria, in which city most of them were written or cast into their present shape. The apocalyptic writings are mainly Palestinian.

its  
tive  
diffi  
Part  
to a  
und  
chap  
sian  
mod  
The  
has  
has  
point  
and  
doub  
Test  
to h  
Early  
place  
tincti  
and  
Belie  
read  
unwa  
Mr. S  
the h  
has b  
dozen  
being  
Escha  
third  
Proph  
whose  
ing re  
Part  
more  
The a  
subjec  
his int  
its gra  
tives;  
himself  
has lai  
with a  
on the

itself likewise in the more serious form of a lack of constructive power, which makes the book difficult to read, and more difficult to recollect, even in general outline. For example, in Part I. (Introduction) the apocalyptic writings above referred to appear first in chap. ii., where they are minutely analysed under the head of 'The Documents,' and then reappear in chap. iii. to yield their contribution to the 'History of Messianic Expectation among the Jews to the Christian Era'—a mode of dealing with them as perplexing as it is awkward. The author himself admits that the arrangement of his matter has proved intractable in his hands; for he tells us (p. 25) he has found it 'inevitable that in his preliminary chapters some points should be touched which cannot be fully expounded, and to which we must afterwards recur.' He expresses a doubt whether the last chapter (on 'The Use of the Old Testament in the Early Church') of Part I. ought not rather to have been the first of Part III. ('Messianic Ideas in the Early Church'), where it certainly would more naturally find place. And he betrays an uneasy misgiving whether the distinction he has set up between the matter of this latter part and that of Part II. ('The Attitude of Jesus to Messianic Beliefs') is one that can practically be maintained. The reader will no doubt feel that the misgiving is by no means unwarranted, when he finds that the scanty materials which Mr. Stanton has collected towards fulfilling the promise of the heading of Part III., together with the meagre results he has been able to draw from them, are all contained within the dozen pages of the first chapter of the part, the next chapter being occupied with a 'Comparison of Jewish and Christian Eschatology'—a topic only indirectly Messianic—while the third and last chapter deals with the relation of Messianic Prophecy to the Mythical Theory of Strauss, a subject to whose vital importance we have drawn attention in our opening remarks, and one which is quite as closely connected with Part II. as with Part III., and would probably have been more properly treated as a separate and concluding part. The author shows plainly, not only by his treatment of the subject in this place, but by the preparation made for it in his introductory first chapter (Part I.), that he fully appreciates its gravity as bearing on the credibility of the Gospel narratives; and we therefore regret all the more that, by confining himself within the very artificial limits of the plan which he has laid down, he has not allowed himself room to develop with adequate fulness and force the very just and sound views on the possible genesis of myths out of predictions which he

has barely indicated in the opening, and too briefly expounded in the closing chapter of his treatise (pp. 3, 359).

Another and more serious defect in Mr. Stanton's work we deem it needful to animadvert on, because it is closely connected with that section of it in which much of its most valuable and least known facts are contained, and in no small degree impairs its usefulness. We do not blame his solicitude to separate himself from the school of theologians who hold, or held, that the Jews at the time of our Lord's coming not only might have anticipated, but in point of fact did anticipate, by means of the study of the prophetic scriptures of the Old Testament, the revelation of His life and work which we have in the New. But it seems to us that, in drawing away from this extreme, he has allowed himself to be drawn too near to the opposite one; and that in his treatment of this subject a tendency to minimize the predictive element, and thus the evidential value, of Messianic prophecy is perceptible. And here and there he expresses himself in such a manner as to induce in the minds of his readers a confusion—under which we cannot suppose he himself laboured—between two very distinct questions: one historical—Did the Jews of the time referred to attach a Messianic meaning to certain predictions of their prophets?—the other exegetical—Do those predictions fairly bear the Messianic interpretation which the Christian Church puts upon them? For example, take the following:—

'The belief, represented especially by Schöttgen, and cherished by many older theologians, that all Christian doctrines regarding the office and person of the Messiah had been clearly foreshadowed, or even formally held, among Jews, began to break down towards the latter part of the last century under the influence of the critical spirit' (p. 141).

We readily admit that 'the critical spirit' has done good work in so far as it has corrected exaggerated estimates of the extent to which the Jewish mind had actually been prepared by prophecy to form a distinct forecast of the Messiah's character and functions; and it is undeniable that such exaggerations are not infrequent in Schöttgen, and diminish the trustworthiness of his learned work. But, in making this admission, we surrender no jot of our conviction that the sum total of the truth of the person and office of 'Messias which is called Christ,' as held by His Church, has been 'clearly foreshadowed' in the prophetic scriptures, even though the Jew to whom these oracles of God were committed neither 'formally held' nor (save vaguely, dimly, and in part) conjectured

the  
conv  
deni  
Test  
ing  
basis  
guar  
of th  
was  
Prop  
man  
clear

“  
thoug  
the m  
be bl  
langu  
very  
exper  
forma  
[The  
peace  
and e  
aspira  
often  
instan  
and th  
the Sp  
fulfil  
disapp  
liveran  
aspira  
people  
to the  
offices  
Messi  
phocy  
as in  
wonder  
which  
charge  
of the  
prepar  
His be  
the Ol  
ought  
sation,  
Provid



the fulness of that truth. We do not by any means desire to convey that Mr. Stanton loses sight of—still less that he denies—the presence of the Messianic element in the Old Testament. Far from it; his statements concerning the building up of Messianic expectation in the Jewish mind, and its basis in the Jewish Scriptures, expressly maintain, though in guarded language and modified form, the immemorial belief of the Church, that the Christ who is shown us in the Gospels was (as He claimed to be) foreshown in the Law and the Prophets. The following passage is a good example of his manner of treating his subject, and defines with sufficient clearness the position he takes up:—

‘Some Christian theologians have expressed themselves almost as though they thought that all Christian doctrine was clearly present to the minds of the prophets, and as though the Jews were severely to be blamed if they did not gather it from their prophecies alone. Such language few now consider to be warrantable. . . . It has come to be very generally recognized that illusion, followed by the discipline of experience and disappointment, played no unimportant part in the formation and definition of the clearest Messianic Hope of Israel. . . . [The prophets] speak as though the era of perfect righteousness and peace would be finally ushered in with the overthrow of the oppressors and enemies of Israel that they knew in their own age. Again, their aspirations after a truly righteous and victorious king would seem often to have been stirred by some immediate object of hope, as (for instance) by the birth of an heir to the throne. While they dreamed and thought they were speaking of these deliverances near at hand, the Spirit taught them to utter great words which would only find true fulfilment in a far more distant day. Then, as time went on, after many disappointments in the case of individual men and individual deliverances, later generations of Israelites learned to transfer all these aspirations to one more definitely conceived as *the Saviour* of His people, for whose coming they might have still to wait. But even to the end a very limited conception is formed of His work and offices. Such an account, I would observe, of the formation of the Messianic Hope does not destroy the value of the testimony of prophecy to Christ, although it is not of altogether the same character as in the older view. The prophecies may no longer seem so wonderful, regarded simply as predictions. Yet the actual purpose which the development of the Messianic expectation in Israel discharged, should prove to anyone who believes in the Divine ordering of the world’s history that this expectation was designed by God as a preparation for the coming of Jesus; and, if so, it is a testimony to His being divinely sent. . . . The *historical fact* of the influence of the Old Testament, in preparing the world for the coming of Christ, ought to convince us of its true connexion with the Gospel dispensation, as part of one grand scheme in the counsels of Divine Providence’ (pp. 96–98).

We have no serious objection to raise against the views put forward by Mr. Stanton in the above passage, although we think they might have been expressed in language of more unhesitating confidence, and with less of an apologetic tone. We accept it as a fair account of the genesis and growth among the Jews of the conception of their Messiah, and the expectation of His coming; but we must guard ourselves against being supposed to allow that it is (what, indeed, Mr. Stanton does not offer it as being) even an approximate summary of the results derivable from a survey of the Messianic contents of the Jewish Scriptures. It may be well, however, to remark in passing that the conception of the prophets of Israel, as clearly understanding the full meaning of the words which they were divinely charged to speak, and thus foreknowing all Christian doctrine, has never been so currently accepted in the Church as he seems to imply; nor is it only of late years, and by the light of the modern 'critical spirit,' that theologians have disavowed it. It may suffice to quote the well-known words of Bishop Butler:—

'To say that the Scriptures, and the things contained in them, can have no other or farther meaning than those persons thought or had who first recited or wrote them . . . is absurd, whilst the authority of these books is under examination. Till this be determined, it must in all reason be supposed . . . that they may have some farther meaning than what the compilers saw or understood. And upon this supposition it is supposable also that this farther meaning may be fulfilled. . . . Such completion is equally a proof of foresight more than human, whether the prophets are, or are not, supposed to have understood it in a different sense. I say "supposed," for, though *I think it clear that the prophets did not understand the full meaning of their predictions*, it is another question how far they thought they did, and in what sense they understood them.'<sup>1</sup>

It is, however, to be granted to Mr. Stanton that the popular theology of too many sermons and commentaries is much too free in crediting the prophets with the possession of a full Christian creed, and in reading the whole range of the Gospel revelation into their prophecies. But the question How far, and in what sense, the predictions of the Old Testament were understood by those whom the Spirit moved to utter them, is to be kept apart from the quite distinct question, What meaning was attached to them by those who heard or read them? The former does not really lie within the lines of Mr. Stanton's inquiry, which has for its proper business the investigation of the latter. We shall have occasion presently to return to it,

<sup>1</sup> *Analogy*, part ii. chap. vii.

and to show its bearing on the larger questions of the nature of prophecy, and of its relation to its fulfilments. For the present we pass from it to the more immediate subject of his investigations, to which it only incidentally and indirectly pertains—the history, namely, of the Messianic hope of Israel, and of its development down to the time when Christ came.

And here, at first sight, we are confronted with an almost startling peculiarity in Mr. Stanton's method of presenting the history of the Messianic Hope, which places it in emphatic contrast with the treatment of the same theme, not only by older writers, but by one so recent and in his spirit so essentially modern as Dr. Briggs. He makes that history begin, practically, with the promise given through Nathan to David of the Son, 'the true theocratic king, who should be the representative of God to the people, . . . to whom God's mercy should be pledged for ever, and who should walk with God as a son with his father' (p. 101). For though in a previous passage he refers its beginning to a much earlier point—to 'God's covenant with Abraham'—he guards himself in a footnote against being understood to maintain 'the literal accuracy of the narrative' which records that covenant; and, moreover (if we rightly apprehend his meaning), he reckons the expectations engendered by this covenant as Messianic but in a secondary sense, among the 'beliefs involved in or suggested by the vaguer hope' of the realization of Israel's full dignity and greatness as the people of Jehovah, which gradually became 'connected more or less directly with the Messiah and His times,' and 'may thus not unfitly themselves be called Messianic' (p. 99). St. Paul, a learned Jew, writing to a Church where Jewish teachers were dominant, had no doubt that the promise to Abraham's seed was not to a race merely, but to a person; that it is spoken 'not as of many but as of one, which is Christ' (Gal. iii. 16). This teaching is hardly reconcilable with Mr. Stanton's view, which is that it was not till the farther covenant with David had been superadded, that 'the first great step towards the representation of a personal Messiah was taken.' And even here it is to be observed how cautious is his language: a 'step is taken towards' the definite declaration that in the fulness of time a Deliverer should come; but that declaration in Mr. Stanton's view is not yet explicit: 'a line of descendants, not one pre-eminent individual, is thus far contemplated.' If this be so, it is obvious to remark that the 'personal' element cannot be said to have appeared in the Messianic intimations of a promise not of a future King, but of a dynasty of kings. And if the hopes grounded on

the covenant made with Abraham are rightly relegated to the category of the vaguer and indirectly Messianic expectations, as relating rather to the destiny of the people than to the person of the Messiah, it seems to follow that the covenant made with David, if it points not to the raising up of an individual but to the securing of a family succession, cannot be the source of a truly and in the full sense Messianic anticipation. The hope that sprang from the promise to a family would be but one degree less vague, one degree nearer to the expectation of a coming Person, than that which sprang from the promise to a nation; both alike fall short of the personally Messianic character not in degree merely, but in kind. Dr. Briggs seems more consistent in his treatment of these two covenants, and in his conception of the nature of the promise given through Nathan, when he represents it as part of the chain of predictions of redemption which reckons among its previous links Jacob's blessing on the tribe of Judah, and the promise of the covenant with the seed of Abraham—nay, farther back still, the earlier blessing pronounced by Noah on Shem, and the primal promise to the Seed of the woman, given in the Prot-evangelium. Each of these links, in his view, is a Messianic prediction; they form a series progressively increasing both in grandeur and in definiteness; but all have this common character, that they are primarily generic, relating in their immediate and temporal sense to a race, a people, a tribe, a royal house, and but remotely and in their ultimate scope personal. No questions of the date or authorship of the parts into which the 'higher criticism' has undertaken to resolve the books which bear the name of Moses is suffered by Dr. Briggs to interfere with his investigation of the witness borne by the Pentateuch to the perpetual presence and growth from the first of the Messianic idea and forecast. Accepting without scruple the results which a daring analysis claims to have attained, he holds none the less confidently to his faith in the 'Messianic prophecies contained chiefly in ancient pieces of poetry,' which the Pentateuch (however and at whatever time it assumed its present form) has preserved for us. He traces the 'narrowing of the elective grace of God from the seed of the woman, through the race of Shem, to the seed of Abraham,' yet in such wise that 'this limitation does not destroy the universality of the previous promise.' And so, farther on (to pass by his treatment of intervening predictions for brevity's sake), he goes on to show how 'the kingdom of Israel, the tribe of Judah, is narrowed into the seed of David,' and thus 'the seed of David assumes the place and significance

of  
v. p.

with  
beca  
with  
omi  
hav  
mer  
not  
Mes  
igno  
natio  
the  
or le  
and  
reck  
the  
out,  
part,  
adde  
and  
siah  
read  
enter  
straig  
Pent  
he ha  
the p  
gener  
brief

we are  
nant  
and th  
vance  
all tha  
the na  
phetic  
differ

W  
policy  
deal v  
must  
If the

of the seed of the woman and the seed of Abraham' (chap. iii.-v. pp. 67, 85, 128).

But we shall have occasion presently to deal more fully with this part of Dr. Briggs's work. We refer to it here chiefly because it corresponds with the part of Mr. Stanton's work with which we are engaged, and illustrates by contrast the omissions and want of consistency in treatment which we have noted. We hold that if the personally Messianic element is acknowledged in the Davidic covenant, generic and not personal though that covenant be, then the personally Messianic element in the Abrahamic covenant ought not to be ignored or resolved into the vagueness of a premonition of national greatness. We hold farther that if the blessing on the seed of Abraham is to be reckoned as, in any sense more or less definite, Messianic, the more ancient blessing on Shem, and the primeval promise to the seed of the woman, are to be reckoned as Messianic likewise. And we are of opinion that the example of Dr. Briggs, though, as we shall presently point out, it is an example to be followed with caution, and but in part, shows emphatically how much Mr. Stanton might have added, not only to the completeness of his history of the origin and development of the idea and the anticipation of the Messiah of Israel, but also how largely he might have helped his readers to attain fulness of knowledge of the elements that entered into the Messianic conception, if he had given a straightforward summary of the Messianic contents of the Pentateuch from first to last, instead of confining himself as he has done to the hesitating, almost apologetic, mention of the promise to Abraham and his seed, and the unsatisfactory general summary of the rest which he compresses into one brief clause:—

'The history of the Messianic Hope' (he writes) 'begins, then, if we are to attribute any truth to the Biblical record, from God's covenant with Abraham. During the remainder of the patriarchal period and the age of Moses and of the Judges, it was continually being advanced by fresh proofs and pledges of God's mercy to Israel, and by all that gave definiteness to the idea of the Theocratic constitution of the nation. I forbear' (he adds) 'from reference to particular prophecies or institutions, so as not to raise questions as to the dates of different portions of the Pentateuch' (pp. 100, 101).

We regret that Mr. Stanton should have adopted this timid policy of reserve, hardly worthy of a writer who undertakes to deal with a subject so momentous in its importance. And we must remark that he has failed to follow it out consistently. If the Pentateuch, because the dates of its different parts have

been questioned, is not to be cited as a record of the delivery of particular prophecies, what right has Mr. Stanton to rely on its records of the Abrahamic covenant, of the subsequent history of the patriarchs, or of the Mosaic times, for which those records are the sole authority? If, on the other hand, he accepts on its testimony the record of the promise made by God to Abraham, or even, as he distinctly does accept, the fact of a covenant with Abraham in which the Messianic Hope had its origin, why should he shrink from accepting on the same authority the earlier records of the promise of the Prot-evangelium, or of the Noachic benedictions? or, at least (if the early periods to which these belong be regarded as adding to the difficulty of admitting them as trustworthy), why should he pass by Jacob's blessing on Judah, and Balaam's prophecy of the Sceptre and the Star? Again, if he does not venture to lean on the testimony of the Pentateuch, because the time of its composition or compilation is matter of controversy, how can he justify the use he so largely and conspicuously makes of the later Jewish apocalyptic literature of the pre-Christian Messianic beliefs of the Jews?—documents which many critics assign to a date subsequent to the birth of our Lord, and which he himself believes to have been more or less extensively interpolated by Christian hands? Surely it would have been well to give to the investigation of the age and authority of the Pentateuchal documents some part of the labour and space which he has so lavishly devoted to the discussion of the questions—interesting, no doubt, and worthy of examination, but how infinitely small when compared with the supreme importance of the other!—of the date and integrity of the *Book of Enoch* or the *Sibylline Oracles*.

It is, however, an ungracious task to dwell on the shortcomings (as we cannot but account them) of this part of the book. They are due in some measure to the author's over anxiety to occupy no debateable ground as a basis for any part of the carefully planned structure of his work, and to his caution, which appears to us unduly near to timidity, and which he has been unable to maintain uniformly, in avoiding to commit himself to the maintenance of positions which have been strongly assailed. But it is only fair to recognize that they are in part attributable to a more worthy cause—to the commendable precision with which he has defined his plan, and the faithfulness with which (on the whole) he has carried it out. It is in the nature of a work thus limited in its scope that it must have an air of incompleteness; the necessary brevity with which it touches on questions which, however

tran  
writ  
bute  
or to  
ever  
renc  
are  
insta  
fectl  
omis  
his  
com  
But  
exec  
hims  
grea  
quat  
parts  
that  
the r  
parts  
to th  
it is  
an as  
to th  
patio  
back  
name  
Davi  
dwell  
need  
duce  
only  
tegra  
B  
stage  
pleas  
we gl  
in his  
tation  
of H  
be de  
nation  
Isaiah  
trate



transcendent in their intrinsic importance, are felt by the writer to lie outside his bounds, is apt to be mistakenly attributed by the reader to a deficient estimate of their magnitude or to an irresolute shrinking from the discussion of them, or even to the feeble spirit of concession that prompts the surrender of every assailable position at first challenge. And we are far from imputing to Mr. Stanton that in all or any of the instances where important points are passed over, or imperfectly brought out, in his survey of Messianic prophecy, his omission or slight notice of such points is the expression of his judgment that they are untenable, or of his reluctance to commit himself to the responsibility of maintaining them. But we believe that he would have done more justice to the execution of his plan if he had been less strict in confining himself within its logical limits; his theme is but a part of the great Messianic argument, and a part that cannot be adequately conceived or handled unless in relation to the other parts, and to the whole which they with it constitute. For that argument is one whose cogency is not to be estimated as the result of a simple summation of the results of its several parts; it is cumulative in its nature. For example, the promise to the House of David assumes its true significance only when it is regarded as the climax of a long series of predictions in an ascending scale of amplitude and definiteness; the promise to the woman's seed would hardly suggest any definite anticipation for the future if it were not shown in the light thrown back on it by the successive predictions that illuminate the names of Shem, of Abraham, of Judah, and so onward to David. In the study of an argument of this nature the dwelling on details, the investigation of special parts, however needful, tends unavoidably to weaken the total impression produced; a due appreciation of its strength is to be attained only by an earnest and sustained effort to survey it in its integral unity, and to realize the fulness of its effect as a whole.

But we have perhaps delayed too long over the opening stage of the history as presented by Mr. Stanton. It is a pleasanter duty to follow him in its progress, and to note, as we gladly do, the increase of power and compass manifested in his treatment of it as he proceeds in his work. His presentation of the conception of the Messiah as the King to be, and of His world-wide kingdom of righteousness, leaves little to be desired. It is at once full and vivid, showing the culmination of the promise to David's line in the predictions of Isaiah and Micah, in which the hopes for the family concentrate in the expectation of an individual with whose person

Divine attributes have distinctly begun to associate themselves; then passing on to the oracles in which the faith of Haggai and Zechariah, living through exile and captivity, threw the aureole of prophecy round the person of Zerubbabel; and finally to the imagery of the later pre-Christian Messianic revival, the 'pure King to hold the sceptres of the whole earth for ever and ever,' the 'King sent from the Sun,' of the oldest Sibylline verses—the ideal Chief figured by the 'white ox having great horns' who was first among the oxen, of the vision of Enoch—and the 'Son of David,' the 'righteous King,' the 'Lord's Anointed,'<sup>1</sup> of the Psalmist who sang under the name of Solomon (pp. 103, 108, 112, 116). We note, indeed, with surprise and something of regret that he fails to give to the visions of Daniel their due place in the forming and shaping of the Messianic idea—that in the 'Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven' of the seventh chapter he supposes the prophet to have seen but an 'idealized representation of the final bestowal of glory and power as Israel restored and purified,' glorified man thus representing Israel in contrast with the forms of beasts which symbolized the heathen empires—and that he forbears to dwell on the title, 'Anointed Prince,' used in the ninth chapter, on the ground that (fully though he perceives it to harmonize with previous prophetic 'conceptions of the promised King') 'its Messianic reference in this place is disputed by many' (pp. 109, 110). But, at least, it is satisfactory to learn from a footnote (p. 109) that he is not prepared to give in to the assumption of a Maccabean date for the Book of Daniel,<sup>2</sup> but clearly discerns, and is shocked by, the fraudulent character which that assumption imputes to a book so full of spiritual

<sup>1</sup> *Orac. Sib.* iii. 47-50 :—

... τότε δὴ βασιλεία μεγίστη  
 Ἀθανάτων βασιλῆος ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις φανείται·  
 Ἡξεῖ δ' ἄγνός ἀναξ πάσης γῆς σκήπτρα κρατήσων  
 εἰς αἰῶνας πάντας.

*Ib.* 655, 656 :—

Καὶ τὸτ' ἀπ' ἡλίου θεὸς πέμψει βασιλῆα  
 ὅς πᾶσαν γαῖαν παύσει πολέμοιο κακοῖο.

*Ps. Salom.* xvii. 23, 35, 36 : Ἀνάστησον αὐτοῖς τὸν βασιλέα αὐτῶν νιὸν Δαυὶδ, εἰς τὸν καιρὸν ὃν οἶδας σὺ, ὁ Θεός . . . καὶ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς δίκαιος . . . καὶ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν Χριστὸς Κύριος. We agree with Mr. Stanton that the *Χριστὸς Κύριος* of ver. 36 is a mistaken rendering of *יהוה יהוה*, which no doubt stood in the original, and ought to have been translated *Χριστὸς Κυρίου*.

<sup>2</sup> As regards this assumption we note that Dr. Briggs (p. 412) suggests a compromise—one, we apprehend, not likely to be accepted by the advocates either of the earlier or of the later date of the book.

power, and so emphatically signalized by the use made of it in the New Testament, notably by the Lord Himself (p. 109, *n.* 1).

In passing, however, from Mr. Stanton's delineation—in the main thus satisfactory—of the King-Messiah of Jewish prophecy, to the farther outlines as given by him of the offices and attributes of the object of Messianic Hopes, we perceive a distinct falling-off in decision and adequacy of treatment. It is disappointing to find that he not only accepts as proved the modern theory which assigns the latter portion (chaps. xl.-lxvi.) of Isaiah to the time of the Babylonian captivity (a theory on which we shall have occasion to touch again farther on), but hardly admits that the prophet (whoever he was) who here speaks attributes any properly Messianic character to the 'Servant of Jehovah,' whose figure stands in the foreground of so large a part of these chapters, whether as the object of the Divine good-pleasure, accepted and exalted, or as the oppressed and despised victim, the man of sorrows weighed down by the burden of the iniquity of the people. The writer (we are told) 'appears to portray under this figure the faithful stock of Israel,' the proof offered being that even the expressions in these chapters, which are at first sight apparently Messianic, may be paralleled by instances of similar and equivalent expressions applied to Israel; as, for example, 'almost the same language is used of "Jacob my servant"' at xliv. 1 ff. as that 'which we should be most ready to apply to the Messiah' when we meet it at xlii. 1 ff. This last-named passage, as Mr. Stanton himself elsewhere notes, is expressly so applied by St. Matthew (xii. 18). It is easy to understand why Jewish interpreters, in their struggles to escape from the necessity of identifying the Servant who must suffer with the Messiah who is to reign, should endeavour to make the Servant represent the nation in its humiliation and captivity. And this interpretation naturally commends itself to rationalistic critics of the modern school, notwithstanding the impossibility of applying it consistently, and its manifest inadequacy to account for the language applied to the Servant and the course foretold for him. But we are surprised that it has found acceptance with Mr. Stanton, whose work, as we thankfully recognize, shows a tone and spirit so markedly alien from that school. It appears to us that the Servant, who is admittedly the main theme of these chapters, is definitely indicated as the promised King in a passage which Mr. Stanton is content to refer to slightly in a footnote (p. 107, *n.* 4). It is contained in verses 3-5 of chap. lv., a chapter which clearly forms part of the great

prediction of the Servant and is expressly reckoned as such even by Dr. Briggs, who, as we shall presently see, pushes his analysis of this part of Isaiah into an excess of subdivision. The renewal of the 'everlasting covenant, the sure mercies of *David*' in verse 3, makes it certain that the Son of David, the Messiah-King, is he who in the next verse is 'given for a witness to the peoples, a leader and commander to the peoples.' He again is the same who in the verse following is addressed as the destined instrument of the ingathering of the Gentiles—'Thou shalt call a nation that thou knowest not, and a nation that knew not thee shall run unto thee because of Jehovah thy God and for the Holy One of Israel, for He hath glorified thee'—in language that belongs to the character and mission of the Servant, the Elect who is to be 'the light of the Gentiles,' 'precious and honourable' in the sight of Jehovah (xlii. 6, xliii. 4, xlix. 6). It is not hard to see why a prophecy of comfort, written (at whatever time) for a people conceived as in captivity, with their political life suspended and their royal stock discredited, should seek topics of consolation, less in the hopes that attached to the king and the dynasty, than in the older hopes that came down from patriarchal times, the recollection of the covenant with Abraham and his seed, and the election of Israel to be the 'people of God.' This consideration accounts for the obvious fact that Israel the Servant rather than David the King is the figure on which, in this portion of the prophetic scriptures, the faith of God's people is invited to fix its desires. But the two figures are but different aspects of the same personality. On the one hand, the King of God's people is God's *Servant*, and David himself bears that designation ('My Servant David') in words uttered by the LORD Himself;<sup>1</sup> on the other hand, the people and nation are fitly impersonated in the *King*. The prominence, therefore, of the idea of the Servant in the prophet's thought by no means excludes from thence the presence of the idea of the King, in one place (as we have shown) definitely expressed, elsewhere latent. But can it be reasonably doubted that the prophet's ideal is everywhere a person, not a personification; an individual, not the aggregate of a people? The Servant whose office it is 'to bring Jacob again to the Lord,' 'to restore the preserved of Israel' (xlix. 5, 6), is distinguished beyond all possibility of confusion from Israel, on whom that office is exercised. And even if this were not clear, the whole purport and drift of the prophecies that relate to the Servant prove beyond

<sup>1</sup> See 2 Sam. vii. 5; Ps. cxxxii. 10; Jer. xxxiii. 21, &c.

188  
mi  
bu  
and  
Eve  
who  
so p  
indi  
othe  
moc  
is of  
whic  
plau  
the c  
be ta  
hand  
to th  
and  
prop  
We h  
Jehov  
Dr. B  
from  
tion o  
here a  
devel  
ordea  
the P  
contai  
the fo  
blessi  
finally  
reach t  
in the  
nay, in  
in the  
ministr  
that H  
is upon  
good ti  
broken  
opening  
the acc  
As  
Stanton  
Jehoval  
VOL.

mistake that he is conceived as one possessing personal attributes, experiencing personal emotions, doing personal work, and (above all) subjected to personal indignity and wrong. Even among the Jews, as is well known, many interpreters who shrank from the notion that Messiah was to suffer, saw so plainly that the description was not of a nation but of an individual, that they supposed it to relate to Jeremiah, or some other great but persecuted prophet—a notion which even in modern times has been adopted by some! This interpretation is of value only in so far as it testifies to the failure of that which makes collective Israel the Servant; in itself it has little plausibility. The language of this portion of prophecy, as, on the one hand, it presents an image too definite and human to be taken to stand for an abstract nationality, so, on the other hand, it is so high in its pitch, and attributes such vast results to the career, and above all to the death, of him whose person and mission it shows forth, that no prophet, nor the whole prophetic order, can be accounted adequate to be its theme. We hold, therefore, that this ideal of the suffering Servant of Jehovah is a part, or rather a phase, of the Messianic ideal, as Dr. Briggs unhesitatingly accepts it; and we thankfully adopt from him (p. 321) the instructive observation, that the conception of the Messiah as one disciplined by suffering does not here appear for the first time, but is found more or less fully developed from the first origin of Messianic promise in the ordeal of conflict pre-ordained for the Seed of the woman in the Protevangelium, in the intimation of Egyptian bondage contained in the covenant with Abraham and his seed, and in the forewarning of chastisement which is interwoven with the blessings of the promise to David and his house. And finally we point to the fact that the Sufferer whose afflictions reach their climax in death in the fifty-third chapter, is he who in the sixty-first assumes to himself Messianic attributes—nay, implicitly entitles himself by the designation of Messiah, in the memorable words which, in entering on His public ministry in the synagogue of Nazareth, the Lord Jesus claimed that He then and there fulfilled: 'The spirit of the Lord GOD is upon me; because the LORD *hath anointed me* to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the LORD.'

As a set-off against the deficiencies we regret in Mr. Stanton's appreciation of the true character of the Servant of Jehovah, it is right to note that in a subsequent passage

(p. 125) he admits the probability that in pre-Christian teaching the conception of the Servant had already become associated with the Messiah's person. He suggests that the Targum of Jonathan, in which the Servant (though without his attributes of suffering) is taken to be the Messiah, represents the earlier Jewish interpretation of these prophecies. And he justly remarks, 'The New Testament applies the title to Jesus [Matt. xii. 18; Acts iii. 13, &c.] with no sign that its Messianic sense was new. . . . The thought naturally suggests itself that the early disciples were not the first to interpret thus.'

We must be more brief in our review of Mr. Stanton's discussion of the questions whether the character of Prophet and of Priest, as well as of King, entered into the pre-Christian conception of the Messiah. As regards the prophetic character, we are again disappointed to find that he gives but a hesitating answer (pp. 126-129). He finds a difficulty in the Messianic application usually given (as by Dr. Briggs, p. 110) to the passage of Deuteronomy (xviii. 15-18), where the raising up of the Prophet of the future, like unto Moses, is promised, because he thinks it 'does not speak primarily of a single prophet, but promises that the people shall not be left without prophetic guidance,' and because we nowhere 'in the Old Testament find the fulfilment of this promise connected with the person of the theocratic King.' Yet, as we have already seen, he does not hesitate to trace the hope of a personal King-Messiah to a covenant in which 'a line of descendants, not one pre-eminent individual,' is the immediate purport of the promise. As in the one case the promised line of kings, so in the other case the foretold succession of prophets, leads the eye of hope on to the supreme fulfilment embodied in One, Prophet at once and King. And if in the Old Testament the Prophet to be raised up like unto Moses is nowhere directly identified with the King to be born of the line of David, it is surely plain that that Prophet reappears in the prophecies that set forth the Servant of Jehovah. They who interpreted those prophecies as relating to Jeremiah or some other of the prophetic order, utterly wrong though they were as to the person, were right in discerning the prophetic character of that Servant. 'My servant Moses,' 'My servants the prophets': these expressions appropriate 'servant' as the special designation by which the Lord marks men for the prophetic function; and the office of him who is by a supreme title the Servant of Jehovah as messenger, to Israel first, and then farther to the Gentiles, as preacher of glad tidings, as herald of 'the acceptable year of the LORD and the day of vengeance of our God,'



is in the highest conceivable sense the office of Prophet. If then we have rightly concluded that in the Servant of Jehovah we are to recognise the Messiah, it follows that the prophetic office enters into the Messianic idea. Mr. Stanton has of course no difficulty in showing from the Gospels that though at the Christian era the expectation of 'the prophet' to come, founded on the passage in Deuteronomy, was rife, yet the popular belief distinguished 'the Prophet' from 'the Christ.' He admits, however, that in one place in the Gospel of St. John (vi. 14, 15) it appears that the Galilean multitude were ready to identify this prophet with the King-Messiah. He quotes from St. John also a narrative which (iv. 25) gives evidence that Samaritan belief, founded as it was on the Pentateuch solely, with no knowledge of the prophets, and uninfluenced by loyal yearning towards the line of David, looked for Messiah as a prophet merely. And yet again he points out that the foretold prophet of Deuteronomy, and the king promised in the prophetic books, appear as one person in the expression, 'Him of whom Moses in the Law, and the Prophets, did write,' in a third passage of the same Gospel. The same inference follows from the 'Jesus the Prophet' of Matt. xxi. 11, when compared with the 'Hosanna to the Son of David' of verse 9. The fair conclusion, therefore, would seem to be, that while different minds were drawn by temper or circumstances to dwell on the Messianic ideal, some in its kingly, some rather in its prophetic aspect, there were also some who discerned the larger truth of the conception of Him which combines the attributes of Prophet and King.

But what of the third office, that of Priest, which in current Messianic theology is so uniformly associated with the other two? Here we find ourselves in substantial agreement with Mr. Stanton in regarding the priestly character of the Messiah to be 'pre-eminently a Christian conception.' No real trace of it has been adduced from Jewish authorities; and in the Old Testament itself it appears explicitly in but one place, Ps. cx. 4, where it is connected, as is well known, with the priesthood, not of Aaron, but of Melchizedek. Many readers will no doubt be surprised to learn from Mr. Stanton that the priesthood of the Messiah appears in the New Testament for the first time in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which book alone (written admittedly in the latter part of the apostolic age) it is dwelt on or even mentioned, though no student of that Epistle can have failed to note that it is there identified with the priesthood of Melchizedek, after the Psalm above referred to, and contrasted with that of Aaron. Yet it may

well be maintained that in the office of Aaron and his successors, 'the priest *the anointed*,'<sup>1</sup> to use the proper style by which he is entitled in the book of Leviticus (iv. 3, 5 ; vi. 22), a Messianic intimation is latent ; while the special function of the Aaronic High Priest receives in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 7-12) its well-known Messianic interpretation. Nor is it to be overlooked that in one Psalm which the Messianic idea thoroughly pervades—the 132nd—the Anointed, the Heir of David, the LORD'S Servant, who is the Psalmist's theme, appears at the close wearing not the kingly crown ('*atarah*'), but the priestly (*nezor*), with its golden plate, or flower (*tsits*).<sup>2</sup> And conversely, in the book of Zechariah we see Joshua the high priest crowned as king with the twofold kingly crown ('*atarah*') of silver and of gold, to represent him, even the Lord's 'Servant the Branch,' who 'shall sit and rule upon his throne, and shall be a priest upon his throne,'<sup>3</sup> in whom the royal Heir of David is admittedly designated. In these passages it is apparent that the bestowal of priestly attributes on the King, and of kingly attributes on the Priest—in both in immediate connexion with the title Servant of Jehovah—is an indubitable, if not conspicuous, intimation that the Promised One of prophecy is to bear the character not only of the Prophet-Servant like Moses, and of the King, the Heir of David, but moreover of the Priest who shall intercede and atone after the likeness of Aaron.<sup>4</sup>

Space will not permit us to follow Mr. Stanton farther, or to trace with him the process by which the Jewish idea of the Messiah, whatever elements it may be held to have contained, and to whatever extent it prevailed, was transformed into the Christian ; the 'transfiguration of the old belief' (as he happily expresses it) in which the Christ of the Gospel manifested Himself, fulfilling and transcending the highest conception of Jewish faith, the utmost inspiration of Jewish prophecy, glorious, eternal, divine.<sup>5</sup> He might, as it appears to us, have done ampler justice to the fulness of the conception of Christ's person in the 'four (practically) undisputed Epistles' of St.

<sup>1</sup> הכהן המשיח = ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ χριστός (LXX, except in iv. 3).

<sup>2</sup> Ps. cxxxii. 18 (יציין נזר) ; cf. Exod. xxviii. 36 (ציין = πέταλον [LXX] ; xxix. 6 (נזר) ; xxxix. 30. <sup>3</sup> Zech. vi. 11-13 (עטרה).

<sup>4</sup> See on this subject the Bishop of Derry's Bampton Lectures (*The Witness of the Psalms to Christ*, 2nd ed., p. 133), a work in which the Messianic Ideal as shown forth in the Psalter is depicted with rare fulness of illustration as well as eloquence.

<sup>5</sup> It is strange that Mr. Stanton does not notice the signal fact that the Messiah of Ps. xlv. 6 is directly addressed as 'God.' See below for farther remarks on this passage.

Paul; and he might have strengthened his argument to prove that St. Paul's belief in Him as Divine in the utmost sense was the general belief of the Church, if he had remarked how the Apostle assumes that not only in Corinth, a Church of which he was the founder, but in Rome, a Church which when he wrote he had never visited, the faith touching on the person of Christ, and the religious apprehension of Him as the object of worship, was in full harmony with his own faith in Christ, his own worship of Christ. But on the whole we gladly acknowledge the force with which Mr. Stanton has presented the Messianic ideal as He Himself conceived it who in His own person was its realization—as His Church from the first and in all her branches received it—as it has ever since abode in every Christian heart, not as the mere object of a speculative belief, but as a quickening and regenerating power.

Of the general plan and character of Dr. Briggs's work we have already given some indications. Its design is comprehensive—ranging from the first to the last of Jewish prophecy; and it is carried out with a completeness, and even fulness of detail, which are very noteworthy, especially in a book of such moderate dimensions. The arrangement of its parts is precise and clear; everything is in its place, and each is presented in due order, and articulately. And the principles on which he proceeds are enunciated with a definiteness quite equal to that with which the outlines of his design are laid down. Thus, on one hand, he is unambiguous in asserting the supernatural character of Old Testament prophecy, and its forecasts of the future; as where he declares (p. 42) that 'the insight of the Hebrew prophet transcends the native energies of human perception,' and that 'we are constrained to think of the Divine mind as the source and inspiration' of 'Hebrew predictive prophecy.' On the other hand, he is no less emphatic in affirming the canons of the 'Higher Criticism,' in which—as regards its methods in dealing with Scripture and their outcome—his faith is not less firm, and (we must add) considerably more operative, than in the Divine character which he claims for prophecy. In his mind the fourfold analysis under which the Pentateuch resolves itself into four distinct narratives and as many codes, yields as its result no mere theory, but a fact as certain as the existence of the books thus analyzed; the four narrators—the priestly, the prophetic, the theocratic, and the deuteronomic, and the 'inspired editor who combined these stories into a matchless organism to constitute for all time the fundamental Divine Word to mankind'—these are in his eyes

this suc-  
style by  
vi. 22),  
action of  
Hebrews  
Nor is it  
nic idea  
Heir of  
theme,  
'atarah'),  
(*tsits*).<sup>2</sup>  
shua the  
ly crown  
ne Lord's  
s throne,  
the royal  
passages  
es on the  
th in im-  
ah—is an  
Promised  
ly of the  
e Heir of  
cede and

farther, or  
dea of the  
contained,  
ed into the  
he happily  
manifested  
ception of  
ecy, glori-  
have done  
of Christ's  
les' of St.

לון [LXX];  
(עשרה).  
Lectures (*The*  
in which the  
h rare fulness

al fact that the  
low for farther

persons as real in their individuality as Moses or David or Ezra. So, again, as to the Prophetic Books. 'It is a law of prophecy that the historical situation of the prophet should be the basis of his prediction' (p. 294); or (as he expresses the same principle in its negative form earlier in his book) 'the future events cannot be presented in prediction in the circumstances of the future and from the point of view of the future' (p. 57). And therefore, not only the latter chapters of the book commonly ascribed to Isaiah, from chap. xl. to the end, are set down by Dr. Briggs (in common with most of the votaries of the Higher Criticism) to a supposed prophet of the Babylonish captivity, but chaps. xiii., xiv., and xxxiv., xxxv., are pronounced to be earlier works of the same author; while for chaps. xxiv.-xxvii. a third author, intermediate in date between the true Isaiah and his Babylonian imitator, is imagined. On like grounds, and with equal confidence, even such Psalms as the twenty-second and the fortieth are assigned to the same late period, because the sufferings they describe 'are ideal sufferings, based upon the experience of Israel in exile, and especially of the pious prophets' (p. 327).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> We note that Mr. Stanton (p. 107, n. 3) assumes without argument 'the truth of the view now so general among critics,' that Isaiah xl.-lxvi. is the work of a prophet of the Babylonian Captivity. Mr. Matthew Arnold, adopting the same view and extending it to chaps. xiii., xiv., &c., gives it as his main reason for thus breaking up the book, that by so treating it the reader is 'enabled to enjoy much more' both the passages themselves which he regards as interpolated and the original work when freed from the interpolations (*Isaiah of Jerusalem*, p. 32). On what grounds he believes that Isaiah (or the 'deutero-Isaiah') proposed it to himself as his aim to be 'enjoyed' by his readers, he omits to state. Dr. Briggs goes farther still in the process of dismemberment; but, to do him justice, adduces arguments proportionably more numerous (if not more forcible) for so doing. See his argument from language, p. 294 (note); from metre, p. 339. As to the former, we have to remark that his observation on the disuse of the *varv* consecutive (or converse) is not borne out by the great authority of Ewald; and we will add that a writer occupying a standpoint so peculiar as we consider Isaiah to do in chaps. xl. to end—a standpoint ideal not actual—may naturally be expected to be peculiar in his use of the delicate construction in question. As to the test of 'metre,' how insecure it is we may judge, when we find him laying down in his text that the portions of the prophecy of the 'Servant' (Isa. xl.-lxvi. 12), which are in 'trimeters,' 'were originally a prophecy by itself, while in a note to the same page (339, n. 2) he naively regrets the difficulty of distinguishing these 'trimeters' from the 'hexameters' of the other portions, which are usually divided by a middle 'cæsura' into two trimeters! It is hard to understand how he can build so confidently on Hebrew so-called 'metre,' of which so little is known. And, moreover, even if Hebrew metres could be as certainly discriminated as those of Greek or Latin poetry, the argument he founds on them would be no less absurd than if he were to conclude that every Greek tragedy was due to a dual authorship—the *senarii* being assigned to a dramatic poet, and the choruses to a lyric *collaborateur*.

Of course we are aware that in all this there is nothing new. Dr. Briggs is simply following opinions and adopting results which are commonly current among writers on the Old Testament of the modern school. The novel—or at least unusual—nature of Dr. Briggs's position is not in the views which he puts forward, nor in the confidence with which he lays them down as if the mere statement of them was sufficient to compel assent to them; for those views are the commonplaces of that school, and the confidence is habitual with those writers. It consists rather in the attempt to combine these views with the firm faith in the predictive element of prophecy, its supernatural character, and its Divine inspiration, which belong to the creed of old-fashioned orthodoxy. Or perhaps (for attempt implies a conscious effort) we should more justly describe his peculiar mode of proceeding as the free handling of naturalistic criticism, coupled with the maintenance of the dogmas of supernatural belief, in apparent unconsciousness of all question of the compatibility of these two elements, which are left to adjust for themselves their mutual relations, the author taking for granted (as it seems) that room is to be found for both within the four corners of his scheme. And yet one would suppose the inconsistency of this mode of dealing must have made itself felt by him at every turn. When he gave up the Pentateuch to the Higher Criticism for dismemberment, and was content to accept it back again as a congeries of fragments to be distinguished into four groups, how can he have failed to perceive that he could no longer rely on it to furnish materials for his chronological development of the Messianic Ideal—for tracing its progress backward from Moses to Abraham, from Abraham to Noah, from Noah to Adam? When he accepted it as a principle that the prophets were limited, by the 'law' we have already cited as laid down by him, to foresee the future from the point of view of the present and not otherwise, he ought to have been aware that no such limitation could stand side by side with the claim to Divine inspiration which, as we have seen, he no less confidently puts forward. For the Spirit of God, if indeed the working is of Him, cannot be conceived as thus restrained in His operation; and who shall say, He reveals to the seer the far distance of the prophetic picture, but He will not, or cannot, place him amid the surroundings of an ideal present? Who can suppose He must needs leave him at the view-point of the actual circumstances of his present, to find for himself the foreground of that picture in the facts of his historic situation?

This failure to reconcile naturalistic theory with faith in the supernatural—or even to perceive that they need reconciling—is the main defect in Dr. Briggs's work, and is a heavy set-off against the merits we have allowed to it. The clearness with which he enunciates the principles he maintains—whether of his theory or of his faith—is commendable; but though it helps the reader to see (what the writer seems not to see) the contradictions between the two sets of principles, it gives no help towards reconciling these contradictions, and finding room for the human element in prophecy side by side with the Divine. The orderly distribution of the contents of the book and its symmetrical construction we have already noticed, and have contrasted them favourably with Mr. Stanton's defective arrangement; but they prove on closer examination to be the mere methodical juxtaposition of parts, and not the unity of an organic whole. It is not difficult to put one's materials together so as to make an effective show of skillful combination and order, if one declines to embarrass oneself with the consideration of their mutual relations and bearings on one another; but the neat outward uniformity of an edifice so produced is but a poor thing if it is found wanting in internal fitness and structural congruity.

Turning from the general plan and principles of the book to its details, we have again to note faults which seriously mar it in what would otherwise be a valuable and interesting portion of its contents. There is so much of obscurity in the prophetic writings of the Old Testament, even in the Psalms, whose words are so familiar to us in their use in public worship, that we welcome every essay at retranslation made by competent Hebraists. Of Dr. Briggs's competence as a scholar we make no question, and we gladly admit that he has thrown light on many dark corners of prophecy by the renderings which abound in his pages. But he has too often been content to miss the spirit of the original in striving to represent its letter with philological and grammatical over-exactness, and the result is servility of rendering, not fidelity. It would be easy to instance passages whose beauty or sublimity is lost in renderings as clumsy in verbal baldness as a school-boy's crib, or even as ludicrous as a travesty.<sup>1</sup> This fault is due to lack of literary judgment and taste; but a graver one

<sup>1</sup> Take, for examples, p. 199, 'For as regards every piece of armour of the one arming himself with clatter, and garment rolled in blood' (Is. ix. 5); p. 229, 'Jahveh, Elohim, Sabaoth, how long dost Thou smoke during the prayer of Thy people?' (Ps. lxxx. 4); p. 242, 'Turn, turncoat children, is the utterance of Jahveh' (Jer. iii. 14).



remains to be noted, springing from deficiency in qualities yet more important for a Biblical scholar—of caution, namely, and reverence. It is the fault of rashness in tampering with the text, and a freedom amounting to licentiousness in altering, omitting, or transposing according to his own ideas of what the sense or context or metre require, and (in too many cases) with no shadow of authority from the Septuagint or elsewhere. In some cases this is done to support a theory, as when he omits the name 'Jehovah' from Gen. ix. 27, and the words 'and in thy seed' from xxviii. 14; but more frequently he is guided simply by his own notion of what the sacred writer ought to have written. Let anyone examine, for example, Dr. Briggs's recasting of the famous passage of Balaam's prophecy (Numb. xxiv. 17-19), as given at p. 107, and he will admit that we have not expressed ourselves too strongly in our censure of his violent handling of the Scriptures he professes to translate. And we fix on this instance merely because it is an easy and conspicuous one, not because it stands alone: others no less flagrant abound in the book. It is necessary therefore to use his renderings with caution, and with a constant eye to the footnotes in which he duly records his dealings with the text. With this serious reservation, we can recommend them as useful and instructive. But one case of mistranslation we must point out, as it relates to a passage of unique importance, and affects the conception of the Messianic ideal at its highest point. How can Dr. Briggs justify himself in perverting Ps. xlv. 6, by the unworthy rendering, 'Thy throne, *O Divine One*, is for ever and ever'? He must know perfectly well that the two instances he cites 'where *Elohim* is used for the exalted monarchs and heavenly intelligences' (Ps. viii. 5; lxxxii. 6) are not to the point: for in each of them it is used as an ordinary plural of a number of persons; whereas in the passage in question, as rendered by him, it is addressed to one, the 'King,' the 'Mighty,' whose bridal is the theme of the Psalms, and must therefore be taken as a 'pluralis majestatis,' by the well-known use which makes it the fit and usual name of God. Accordingly, among all the shifts (for there are several)<sup>1</sup> by which the ingenuity of commentators, Jewish or modern Rationalistic, has striven to get

<sup>1</sup> One commentator would supply 'Thy throne God [will establish] for ever;' another, 'Thy throne [is a throne of] God for ever,' each of which renderings involves an inadmissibly harsh ellipsis. A third rendering is 'Thy throne-of-God [is] for ever,' which is ungrammatical; while the fourth, 'Thy throne [is] God for ever,' is one of which it may be said that it is as repugnant to the religion of the Hebrews as the previous one is to their language.

rid of the fact that in this Psalm the Messiah is called *Elohim*, there is not one who takes *Elohim* here to mean anything short of GOD in the supreme sense; their efforts are directed towards finding some rendering by which *Elohim* shall not be a vocative addressed to the King-Bridegroom. Dr. Briggs sees clearly that it is so addressed; but he perversely assumes that it is addressed in a lower and unexampled sense. He might have learned better from Rosenmüller, who (against his theological bias) saw clearly that *Elohim* was to be read here as a vocative, and explained that 'the Psalmist styles the King of whom he sings, God, because he held Him to be truly a King greater than human, as also the mention of eternity shows plainly.'<sup>1</sup>

We thankfully acknowledge that Dr. Briggs holds and asserts with unreserved fulness the truth that He in Whom this psalm, and all Messianic prophecy, had its fulfilment, was Very God; and we are therefore all the more at a loss to account for his having gone so far wrong in this instance. Indeed, the firmness with which he grasps and maintains the great central truth of the Godhead of the Christ goes a long way towards ensuring his general trustworthiness as a guide in the interpretation of the Messianic Scriptures, and serves in great measure as a corrective in his occasional aberrations, such as that just now instanced. And it is only fair to add that he has done a substantial service by the thoroughness of his investigation into the Messianic contents of the Old Testament and the careful industry with which he has noted every line and touch and transferred them to his pages, each to take its place in the completed picture of Him—the King, Prophet, Priest—the Son of God anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power, Whose attributes and works each prophecy foreshowed in part and in degree, but Whose person and life reveal themselves only in full survey of all prophecy as a collective whole. And in this, in the fulness of His presentation of the Image of the Messiah to be, as the Ideal foreshown by the Old Testament in all its parts, consists the value of his work.

If, then, we revert to the grounds laid down at the opening of this article, and proceed to form an estimate of the two books before us, testing their value by the amount of help they give us in indicating the evidential use of prophecy as a proof of revelation, and in repelling the attempt of Strauss to pervert the coincidences between the Old Testament predictions and the evangelical narratives into an argument of the

<sup>1</sup> *Scholion in Vetus Test., in loc.*

mythical character of the latter, we may fairly welcome both, notwithstanding the shortcomings which we have felt it our duty to point out freely, as valuable accessions—not the less valuable because they come from writers who show themselves to be under the influences of the modern critical school. Of the two, Mr. Stanton's work renders more direct service and contributes more new information bearing on the matters in controversy; and it is hard to see how the school of Strauss can henceforth maintain their master's view that the Gospels are a collection of myths arising out of popular anticipations of what the Messiah of prophecy was expected to do and to be, in the face of the evidence collected in this work showing that, in point of fact, such expectations (though cherished by the devout and far-seeing few) did not prevail among the Jewish people at large when the Lord Jesus came among them. But the wider scope and ampler range of the investigation conducted by Dr. Briggs gives his work a proportionably larger value and usefulness. No one can rise from the study of it without feeling that it has enabled him to grasp more firmly the truth and reality of the coincidence between the ideal Messiah, foreshown by the prophets, and the actual Messiah of the Christian faith, as shown by the evangelists in their records of the Life, Words, and Works of the Son of Man. At the same time, no careful reader will fail to be satisfied that the nature and complexity of the Old Testament Messianic ideal, and the diversity of the elements which enter into it (as set forth in this book), are such as to preclude the notion that it could have so impressed itself on the popular imagination as to have engendered such anticipations as Strauss's mythical theory postulates, or to have served as a model for the evangelists to copy in constructing their portraiture of Him of whom they write.

We cannot, indeed, commend either book as an adequate exposition of their great common theme, or as likely to take a permanent place among standard works on Scripture, or to rank side by side with the *Propædia Prophetica* of the late Dean Lyall—a work whose recent reissue proves that it is by no means out of date, but still holds the place it deserves in the esteem of students of the prophetic Scriptures. But both, in their way, are calculated to do useful and noteworthy service, and each contains material which all future writers who venture on the same ground will find too valuable to be overlooked.

---

## ART. VI.—THE PHILOSOPHY OF AMERICA.

*Realistic Philosophy Defended in a Philosophic Series.* By JAMES M'COSH, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., President of Princeton College. Vol. I. Expository; Vol. II. Historical and Critical. (London and New York, 1887.)

A PHILOSOPHY which is to be the complete expression of American genius, which is to provide the final answer to all the questions which have troubled thinkers, which is to be eclectic yet independent, *à priori* yet empirical, in harmony with common sense without ceasing to be connectedly reasoned—such is the promise with which the astonished reader is greeted at the opening of the volumes before us. America, he is told, has never yet had a philosophy answering to its own peculiar genius. It has had to borrow from other nations, and has never been wholly satisfied. For 'Yankees are distinguished from most others by their practical observation and invention. They have a pretty clear notion of what a thing is, and if it is of value they take steps to secure it' (i. 4). Other nations have been satisfied with lofty idealistic systems, woven by the brain out of its own material, or with a philosophy sultry and dreamy as the Indian summer. The English school has been characterized by profound sense, and so on. But none of these fully answer to the expectation which Americans entertain of philosophy. They must have something with a tendency and colour all their own. It is to supply this want that Dr. M'Cosh takes pen in hand, and the type of philosophy which commends itself to him under the circumstances is Realism.

Realism is a word full of philosophical associations. It brings back the air of the controversy with Nominalism, a controversy which still haunts the early pages of logic books. It calls to mind the Transfigured Realism which is Mr. Spencer's contribution to the philosophy of the day. But in neither of these directions are we to look for the meaning it bears in this book. Here it is in strong opposition both to Idealism and to Agnosticism: it is the philosophy of things as they are, as opposed to those speculative systems which either assert an element of mental activity in our knowledge of things, or deny the possibility of certain knowledge altogether. It is certainly a change to find in a philosophical work the definite assumption that we see things as they are; that there

is no room for mistake or deception between the mind and its object. We propose to enquire how far we can regard it as a change for the better.

But before we approach this very serious question we think it right to notice the carelessness with which the book has been carried through the press; and we are sorry to say also that at times this carelessness seems to be chargeable upon the author. There are some rather surprising misprints. Thus (i. 61) we have the *Criticke* of Pure Reason; and we imagine that 'the angle of incidents' (i. 74) is a blunder of a similar kind. Greek words also have met with a cruel fate. They are printed almost uniformly with wrong accents. So we have οὕ *ἐνεκα* (i. 132), *εἶδος* twice (pp. 132, 136), *λογισμός* (p. 77), and *ὕλη* (p. 132). Some of these, however, are printed rightly in the second volume. Then, again, the spelling of some words is uncertain. The Stagirite occurs in vol. i. p. 19, whereas in vol. ii. he appears as Stagyrite (p. 134). So sceptical sometimes blossoms into skeptical, and in vol. ii. p. 144 both forms occur within a few lines. These, we may suppose, are misprints, and if so they disfigure the book, and might easily have been avoided with a little more care in the correction of the proofs. There are other mistakes, however, which cannot be due to the printer. So (i. 70) we have a terrific word, 'apodictive,' and on p. 117 another, 'orective.' There can be no possible reason for forcing this Latin termination on a Greek word: it is a linguistic outrage. There is some uncertainty also in the usage of the word 'apodictic.' On p. 48 (vol. i.) it is explained as an Aristotelian term, answering to the modern 'demonstrative.' But this word (p. 73) is used as a synonym of 'self-evident.' If there is one thing more than another which 'apodictic' could not have meant to Aristotle it is 'self-evident.' The impossible form *Gnoctic* is given (i. 117) as an alternative to *Gnostic*; on p. 62 we have '*Prærogativæ Instantiarum*,' and on p. 211 the verb 'to formulise.' In vol. ii. p. 13, after giving Aristotle's definition of virtue, Dr. M'Cosh goes on, 'where it is to be observed he makes virtue to be an act of the will determined by right reason.' It is quite impossible that *ἐξῆς* could ever mean an 'act of the will.' It means a habit or tendency of character, produced by constant acts of the will. There is a very interesting confusion (ii. 45) in the account of John Locke's life. Dr. M'Cosh says, 'In 1651 he entered Christ Church, Oxford, in the grounds of which they still show the mulberry tree which he planted.' He is clearly thinking of Christ's College, Cambridge, in the grounds of which John Milton is said to have

planted a mulberry tree. On the next page also there is an inaccurate statement. 'Sunderland,' says Dr. McCosh, 'by the King's command, ordered his [Locke's] expulsion. He was not expelled, but deprived of his studentship by the dean and chapter of the college.' The letter from Sunderland—which, by the way, is still shown at Christ Church—directs Bishop Fell to deprive him of his student's place, with all the emoluments thereunto belonging. This order was carried out. So much for positive errors. We have also noticed considerable roughness in style, together with much needless repetition. Thus (ii. 80) we have the phrase 'there is very apt to be inaccuracies in them;' and (i. 122) 'an essential part of it [conscience] is the immediately state.' On p. 139, vol. i. modern chemists are said to have discovered sixty-four elements, and certain remarks are added about the possibility of reducing the number. On p. 159 sixty-five elements are said to exist, and the previous remarks are repeated almost word for word. Three times (i. 16, ii. 30, 243) we have a description of the British or American youth, who, having taken a degree in his own country, goes to Germany, and is bewildered by *a priori* philosophers when he gets there. Three times we are given to understand that the production of so new a philosophy as this is an act requiring great intrepidity, in view of the dominance of the old 'monarchical schools' (i. 25, ii. 186, 243). The obscurity of Hegel, and the difficulty of criticizing him, is twice stated (ii. 25, 248). So, too, the general relations of Realism to other philosophies, from that of Plato downwards, are twice stated (i. 86, ii. 251-2). All these are mere cases of repetition; the same thought is clothed in almost the same words. This may be due to the fact that parts of the book have been published before in the *Princeton Review*. Whatever be the cause, however, the effect is to produce weariness on the part of the reader, and we cannot but think that the book as a whole would be greatly improved if the essays of which it is apparently composed had been more carefully worked into shape. But enough of details of form. Let us proceed to the consideration of the matter.

The philosophy presented to the world here is, as we have said, a form of Realism. It is set forth in the first volume on its own merits, in the second by comparison with the views of other philosophers. The most striking fact about it at first sight is the lavishness with which it assumes intuitive principles. We assume, in the first place, the existence of the Self (ii. 3). Here it is in accordance with idealism. Secondly,



it assumes the existence of 'something external, that is, of body as extended and as exercising power' (p. 4). Thirdly, we know qualities both of body and mind, or, if the expression be preferred, 'we know things, mind and body, as having certain qualities.' Fourthly, we know space and time. 'These have a real though not an independent existence. . . . If it be asked, What sort of nature and existence? I answer, What we naturally perceive them to have. Puzzling questions may be asked, but the difficulties cannot unsettle our natural convictions.' Fifthly, 'we know good and evil,' for virtue is 'love according to law,' and both love and law are realities. Sixthly, there are realities in relations. Having discovered the reality of things, we then discover the reality 'of the relation between things—say, their identity in different circumstances, or their likeness, or the production of one by the other. He who denies the reality of these, and makes them mere forms imposed on things by the mind, is so far a sceptic or agnostic, and is seeking to deliver himself from this by becoming an idealist.' Lastly, there are a few more things which it is well to assume, but unnecessary to enumerate. Infinity is one of these (ii. 3-5). So also is the principle of cause and effect (i. 63). Dr. M'Cosh is 'inclined to argue' (i. 7) that the freedom of the will is another of the direct intuitions which we possess.

Such are the positions with which we start: all these may be safely assumed as facts. So large an array of assumed truths naturally excites in us the question, What right have we to assume them? Dr. M'Cosh is alive to the necessity of offering the mind some ground for such an extensive call upon its faith; and he finds the justification for his proceedings in the method and nature of philosophy, and in certain criteria of truth. 'The aim of all investigation in philosophy, as in science, is to discover facts and nothing but facts' (ii. 6). This being so, it follows that the method of philosophy will be the same as the method of science, viz. the inductive method. It was the great mistake of Kant that he proceeded in the critical method. If he had had the good fortune or the good sense to use the inductive method, he would have discovered first truths, though the method 'gives no cogency to them' (i. 17). Bacon is the writer whose mind had clearly grasped this truth. Everyone else is confused and at fault on the subject, except perhaps the Scottish school represented by Reid, Hamilton, and Dr. Chalmers. Having thus established the method to be pursued, the next question will be, What are our criteria of truth? These are easily decided. They

are three: self-evidence, necessity, and universality. Some philosophers have placed the test of necessity as the first. Leibniz is one of these malefactors. Dr. M'Cosh 'demurs to the idea so often pressed upon us, that we are to believe a certain proposition because we are necessitated to believe in it. This sounds too much like fatality to be agreeable to the free spirit of man' (i. 35). These criteria apply to first truths of the various kinds—primitive cognitions, primitive beliefs, primitive judgments—whether with regard to things natural or moral. To extend our knowledge we have inference, immediate and mediate. Of mediate reasoning the syllogism is the universal form (i. 46). This is not, however, the Aristotelian syllogism, necessarily. 'There is a ratiocination which does not proceed upon the principle of classes, but of identity or equivalence' (*ib.*). Into one or another of these all reasoning must come. 'When a professed argument cannot be brought under either of them it is a proof that it is not reasoning' (i. 47). With regard to this chapter on reasoning we should be glad to pass a criticism. We cannot discover any difference according to this presentation of the doctrine between mediate and immediate inference. The canon of the latter is this: 'Whatever is involved in the extension and comprehension of a notion can be legitimately inferred' (i. 44). Whereas the formula of mediate reasoning is, 'Whatever is true of a class is true of all the members of the class.' The illustration given of immediate inference is the following: 'When it is granted that "all men have a conscience," we infer that "this man has a conscience," although he be a liar.' What difference it would make either in theory or result if we intercalated a minor premiss, 'this is a man,' we fail to see. These are the methods of extending our knowledge when the facts are obtained. We now come to enquire for the way of obtaining them. In so doing let us bear in mind that for an inductive philosophy the process of ascertaining facts and their laws is the central interest. It is in this region, therefore, that we look for some new light. We are considerably disappointed, however. The philosopher of America gives us a short chapter on observation and experiment, under the four heads of sensation, self-consciousness, memory, and testimony; and for induction we are referred back to Mill's Canons, with some few alterations and improvements due to Dr. M'Cosh. These additions are thoroughly in the spirit of J. S. Mill, and though on reading them we feel no doubt as to their truth, yet we cannot be sanguine as to their applicability. Dr. M'Cosh has dis-

cov  
scie  
cov  
is t  
(i. 6  
posi  
dece  
have  
min  
so r  
The  
Can  
we  
we a  
poss  
truis  
to p  
perti  
know  
the  
new  
the  
ment  
alrea  
form  
affect  
the p  
we w  
the a  
We c  
'We  
two,  
mind  
law is  
recall  
claim  
the fi  
one;  
comes  
Th  
the id  
this a  
and  
cerned  
implied  
VOL

covered 'that there are three grand ends which men of science have in view in their investigations. One is to discover the composition of the objects around us; the second is to discover natural classes; the third is to discover causes' (i. 64). Under the ill-sounding head, 'Canons of Decomposition,' we are warned 'to separate the object we wish to decompose from all others.' We are then assured that if we have decomposed a portion of any substance we have 'determined the composition of the whole,' but that the elements so reached 'are to be regarded as being so only provisionally.' The separation of the object is often just the difficulty. The Canons of Natural Classes are equally helpful, and of them we read (i. 67), 'These canons guarantee truth. When we are able to place objects in a class we know that they possess the properties of the class.' This seems to be a mere truism. It would be strange indeed if 'when we were able to place objects in a class' they did not possess the properties of the class. Moreover scientists do not always use known classes in their investigations. They frequently alter the boundaries between class and class, and even discover new classes altogether; in such cases our canons leave us in the lurch. Mr. Mill's Canons of Induction need no treatment here; so many writers have shown their inadequacy already. Lastly, these methods are set forth in syllogistic form. We do not think this adds to their value, or, indeed, affects them in any shape or way. We cannot go through all the points which we have noticed in this section of the book; we will call attention to one more, and then pass on. It is the application of the Methods of Induction to Psychology. We quote the application of the Method of Difference (i. 82). 'We see a portrait of Washington for the first time. The two, the portrait and Washington, were never before in the mind together; yet the portrait calls up Washington, and the law is: things that are related, especially things that are like, recall each other.' This is very remarkable. Dr. McCosh claims the credit of enunciating these laws in this way for the first time. We are not surprised if his claim is a true one; for we cannot imagine in what sense the instance given comes under the Method of Difference.

The second part of the *Realistic Philosophy* deals with the idea of Cause. We have seen that Dr. McCosh regards this as an intuitive principle (i. 62). It therefore requires and receives no analysis or proof. We are only concerned with the proper application of it. 'Causation is implied, if not in the whole, at least in the greater part of

our derivative truths' (i. 95). In other words, we apply the idea of Cause whenever we come across an effect. 'We believe that there has been a battle at a certain place, a flood on a particular river, a fire in a dwelling, because we discover effects, which we argue imply a cause' (*ib.*). Dr. M'Cosh then proceeds to divide causation into two classes, objective and subjective, the former referring to physical nature, the other to psychical action. With regard to physical causation Dr. M'Cosh points out that there are always several elements which go to make up a cause, and several elements involved in an effect. Mill's well-known position that Cause is some one of the antecedents which we select by our arbitrary will, and regard as producing the consequents, is a partial statement of the doctrine unfolded by Dr. M'Cosh. 'All the agents acting, whether circumstances, occasions, or conditions, constitute the cause without which the effect would not follow' (i. 102). So again 'the effect properly understood consists of the whole of the agents that have been acting put in a new state' (p. 103). This doctrine, of course, lends itself easily to the Theory of the Conservation of Energy; according to which 'the sum of energy potential and actual, capable of being brought into operation, or in operation, is always one and the same' (p. 104). The whole is made clear (p. 105) by the image of the world as a closed globe, within which there is a perpetual interaction between 'an incalculably large but definite number of bodies.' Hence it follows that energy and causation (which on this theory are realities) are closely allied. Causation begins when energy ceases to be potential and becomes actual. This again accounts for the certainty in causation. It is produced 'by the power acting in the causes' (p. 111), not by 'mere invariable antecedence and consequence' (*ib.*). On turning to psychical causation a difficulty arises. There is no way of translating physical into psychical force. We know as a matter of fact that mental exertion exhausts physical strength, but 'there is no evidence that our mental actions are identical or correlative with bodily motions or activities of any kind' (p. 116). Yet, notwithstanding, in some way or other there is uniformity in the operations of the mind. An orator appeals with certainty to well-known feelings, and produces the effect he wishes. Under certain conditions it is possible to predict with something very like certainty the action of another man. But in all this there is no fixity, like that which we know in the sphere of physical causation. 'We are not able to measure psychical as we do physical energy, in foot pounds'

(p. 118). There is no established system of quantitative relations of psychical activity. Body and mind, then, are related, but the law of the relation is undiscoverable. 'The simplest, and, on the whole, the most reasonable supposition,' in this difficulty, 'is that mind has a potency whereby it acts on body, and body a potency whereby it acts on mind' (p. 119). This reminds us strongly of the 'soporific virtue' which some philosophers assume to account for the sleep-giving power of poppies. The idea of causation is attained through our consciousness of the exercise of muscular power and of will. These powers we transfer, as it were, to external things; we have an intuition that there is power acting on us from things. Such is the account of causation which Dr. M'Cosh gives his readers. There is a chapter on the various kinds of cause, in which the Four Causes of Aristotle are described, but this calls for no remark. We pass on, therefore, to the third section of the expository volume, which treats of Evolution.

We cannot think that any very large addition has been made to the current criticisms of Evolution doctrine by Dr. M'Cosh. His aim is to show the consistency of the idea of Evolution with that of Final Causes, and to mark the limits within which the doctrine of Evolution is valid. The former point has been fully treated by Von Hartmann in his *Wahrheit und Irrthum im Darwinismus*, and again from a different point of view in the *Philosophical Lectures* of the late Professor Green, which have been lately published. And with regard to the other, the failure of the Evolution theory to account for the origin of matter, of life, and of thought, this was pointed out by Dr. Liddon in the sermon published a few weeks after Mr. Darwin's death, and has been marked with considerable elaboration in Dr. Martineau's *Types of Ethical Theory*. The special treatment of evolution, of course, depends on the peculiar view entertained by Dr. M'Cosh of Cause. Into this it will be unnecessary for us to enter.

The last section of the first volume deals with certain questions which arise at the end of every philosophical investigation. They are the deep and serious questions of Providence, Certitude, and Prayer. Here again we do not think Dr. M'Cosh has materially added to the general stock of defensive arguments. He asserts eagerly the importance of realism as giving certainty—the certainty on which alone a true theory of the world and its relations to God can be built. The question of the origin of evil our author leaves

aside as insoluble, clinging to the two assured truths that God is not 'the author of evil, and on the other hand that those intelligent creatures who commit sin are themselves to blame for it' (p. 249).

The volume devoted to criticism is less interesting than the first. It adds little to what has been already said, and the criticisms of the philosophers named in it do not strike us as very profound. Of course the central interest of the whole is the rebuke of the critical method. Dr. M'Cosh can see no good in this method at all. It seems to him to be an inversion of all natural order and to lead to nothing but logical no-thoroughfares. His conception of its arbitrariness and defiance of natural reason might perhaps be best expressed in the saying of Mrs. Poyser, 'There's folks as stands on their heads, and then says the fau't's in their boots.' He cannot understand the difficulty to which it is an attempted answer. We cannot follow him here, nor do we think he has fully estimated the range of the critical method. No doubt Kant was the first to formulate it as a method, but the principle of it rules the whole period of philosophy, which began with Descartes. The rule of Descartes to restrain the will within the limits of clear and distinct thought, the description of the idola in Bacon, both contain in them the principle of criticism of the instrument of thought. What could breathe more completely the spirit of the critical period than the words of Locke in his Epistle to the Reader, quoted by Dr. M'Cosh (ii. 52-3)?

'Were it fit to trouble thee with the history of this essay, I should tell thee that five or six friends meeting at my chamber and discoursing on a subject very remote from this, found themselves very quickly at a stand by the difficulties that arose on every side. After we had a while puzzled ourselves without coming nearer a resolution of these doubts which perplexed us, it came into my thoughts that we took a wrong course, and that before we set ourselves upon enquiries of that nature it was necessary to examine our own abilities and see what objects our understandings were, or were not, fitted to deal with.'

There is no severe criticism of this; yet where Kant is quoted (ii. 200) as saying,

'Pure speculative reason has this peculiarity: that . . . it is able to define the limits of its own faculties,'

we are assured that such criticism requires a prior criticism, and this again a previous one, and so on *ad infinitum*. This is the 'admission of the Trojan horse' from the school of Hume, which involves such serious consequences. This



is the root of all the scepticism and 'agnostics' with which the modern world is beset. The one thing needful, then, is to avoid the critical method. We will take this as our point of departure for the estimate of Dr. McCosh's whole position.

Dr. McCosh notices several times in the course of this work the difference between Greek and modern speculation. The Greeks, he observes, searched after τὸ ὅν and τὸ εἶναι, the moderns after the absolute. He protests against those who would translate τὸ ὅν by 'the absolute,' since he regards such a translation as an anachronism. Lotze, he is glad to find (vol. ii. p. 28) is engaged in the old Greek search for the real, though, like the Eleatics, 'he says too much about such simple objects as existence, being, and real.' We do not wish to defend the translation of τὸ ὅν to which he objects so strongly, but yet for all that it represents a truth. It shows that those who use it feel the close kinship of the ancient and modern investigations under all their difference of form. The same question is really before both schools of thought, but the mode of treating it is different. To the Greek mind the relation of the instrument of thought to its object was not the primary question. The whole interest of their speculations lies outside in the world. It deals with the relation of God and the world, of matter and form, of the real and the phenomenal. This we maintain is its general tone; it is objective. But from the moment Descartes rested all truth upon the validity and permanence of self-consciousness, all this was changed. Truth for him would be more clearly and distinctly known the more nearly our knowledge of it approached this type. Now, thought appears as the vehicle of truth; truth is known only as thought. Hence, so far as philosophy descends lineally from Descartes, it will tend to be subjective—to search for the ultimate account of knowledge in the mind and not in the outer world. The same question is really before Descartes as was before Plato so many centuries earlier, but the whole environment of the mind has changed. Man has learnt to know himself as a personality, very largely through the influence of Christianity, and with this is bound up a wholly different outlook upon the world. It is this indefeasible certainty which is both his warrant for and his test of all other truths. This position once attained, it will follow naturally enough that perpetual criticism will be turned upon the mind. Difficulties left unsolved by Descartes will be undertaken by Spinoza; the casually selected categories of Kant will be followed by the dialectic of Hegel.

The philosophical method just described seems to us to be deserving of commendation in two ways. In the first place, the introspection on which it is based has a real affinity with the inductive method, so much belauded nowadays. It starts with the great fact of self-consciousness, which is really the basis of everything else. Even Locke and Hume, as the late Professor Green argued so earnestly, though they admit no self-consciousness as the basis of thought, are just for that very reason halting and illogical in their philosophy. The critical method, then, so far as it is true to itself, is not perpetually flying in the face of modern inductive science. Then, secondly, philosophy of this type seems to have kept more truly to the real function of philosophy, which, we venture to think, is not the discovery, but the interpretation of facts. Starting, as it does in its present stage, with a self-conscious Ego—a self knowing itself as distinct from modes of itself—it has to proceed to the interpretation of these modes. Some very important consequences follow from this. It follows that the knowledge which can most properly form the object of philosophical investigation will be knowledge attained by processes of thought; in other words, that the criteria of truth which such a philosophy will give must be based on an analysis of thought—on an answer to those questions which Dr. McCosh thinks it unnecessary to treat. What is a *thing* to thought? What is a *fact* to thought? It will not be afraid to recognize a subjective element in thought; indeed, we wonder how Dr. McCosh himself can avoid doing the same, in view of his account of Causation. Surely thought must be the resultant of the interaction of mind and matter, and therefore must necessarily possess a subjective element. Let us observe also that this conception of philosophy fixes the limit of philosophical speculation. It will always have to do with thought and the object of thought. It will deal with the self when engaged in one special form of its activity; and it will have to beware lest it should attempt to force categories and forms thus attained upon other modes of the self, for which they are wholly unfitted. Thought is always in one sense abstract: its terms are always the result of abstraction. It seizes aspects of things, and gives names which apply not only to one case but to others also. And knowledge, just because it is conveyed in thought, is abstract too. The mind holds a multitude of thoughts which are the symbols of particular things. Hence the analysis of thought—the philosophy which comes from this form of speculation—cannot help being bound by the limitations of its origin. Valid in its own region, it ceases

to be fully so in any sphere where abstract thought itself is inadequate.

We have endeavoured to sketch roughly enough what we believe to be the importance of the Critical School of Philosophy, and we have also endeavoured to set down the advantages it possesses. We can find none of these advantages in the philosophy offered to us by Dr. M'Cosh. With a false notion, at the start, of the power and functions of philosophy, with an inadequate analysis of the constitution of a fact, with a portentous array of assumptions, and without any full discussion of the criteria of truth, it would perhaps be hard to construct an available philosophy. And we regret to say that all these deficiencies seem to us to exist in Dr. M'Cosh's work. We have said that the aim of philosophy is not discovery but interpretation, and we think that the history of philosophy bears out our contention. Then, again, we complain that Dr. M'Cosh has given us no proper analysis of a fact. He seems to us to be involved in complete confusion over the question of Sensation and Perception. On the one hand, he is anxious to defend the *à priori* with Kant, and at the same time to deny all the subjective element in thought. Between these two stools his theory comes to the ground. He reminds us that Aristotle was the first 'to establish the grand truth that the senses do not deceive, and that the errors arise from the wrong interpretation of the information given by the senses' (i. 10). But he fails to see the range of this distinction. He warns us to distinguish between original and derived perceptions. 'The former' (i. 51) 'are intuitive without any process of inference, having the sanction of the author of our constitution and never deceiving us ;' whereas the others, being inferential, may involve error. Then from other passages we learn that we have a direct perception of matter, but this matter probably our own organism. With the eye, on the other hand, we have an immediate perception of a coloured surface, presumably outside us. Our contention is that this gives no intelligible account of perception. It simply asserts it as a fact, which anyone could do, whether he be a philosopher or not. And we think that Dr. M'Cosh would have bettered his position by enquiring a little more carefully into the nature of perception. Surely unless the mind takes up and rationalizes the utterances of sense, these last tell us nothing at all. A known sensation which is not at the same time made into a thought is a contradiction in terms. This principle seems to us quite universal. We cannot imagine any fact present to us in full consciousness which

is not expressed in intellectual terms. And where this is the case we believe that the intellectual process of abstraction has taken place; in other words, that in every thought there is a subjective element. A sensation to which no name can be attached, of which nothing can be said, can be to us nothing at all. This, no doubt, is rank Idealism, but we cannot help it. We are strengthened in it by a glance at the array of assumptions Dr. M'Cosh is forced to make in order to avoid it.

One word about the Criteria of Truth. We are forced again to differ from Dr. M'Cosh with regard to the value of the test of Self-Evidence. He puts this first, and protests against those who would give the first rank to the test of Necessity. Surely these have logical order on their side. Until it is explained, self-evidence may be merely a matter of accident. That which is self-evident to one person or to one age may seem hardly probable to another. And why? Simply because the incredulous individual or age has not understood the necessity of the truth in question. Once let this be fully grasped, and self-evidence will follow as a matter of course. We do not deny that in some cases self-evidence may come first in the order of experience; we may be absolutely certain of some truth, and yet be unable to deduce its necessity; but we do urge that in the last resort the self-evidence would be found to depend on a prior necessity. The difference between our own opinion and that of Dr. M'Cosh is a result of the difference in our respective conceptions of philosophy. To a process of interpretation of facts necessity is the final justification; for a process of discovery self-evidence may be sufficient as a starting-point.

We have not room to enter into all the points as to which we differ from Dr. M'Cosh. Indeed it would be wholly unnecessary. He has failed entirely to persuade us of the invalidity of the method of Idealism, and his failure at this point implies that we must differ from him all along the line. We quite agree with him in condemning the negative or sceptical results which follow in some cases from unreasoning faith in Idealism; this is not the place, however, for offering our explanation of them. But we are perfectly sure also that, if the problems of mind are to be approached philosophically at all, a crude rough and ready method will be of no use. Those whose minds are not attracted by philosophy will remain in the same state of conviction whatever philosophers may say; and those to whom philosophy is a pleasure and a reality will turn away from a system which offers them no-

thing but an assertion, in the somewhat loose phraseology of common life, of the very facts of which explanation is desired. So we cannot but hope that, if America is in need of a philosophy of her own, she will find one more true to the traditions of philosophy than this—a philosophy which shall neglect no aspect of truth, which shall be fearless and rigid in its method, yet not ignorant of the limitations of its sphere. Such a philosophy, we think, has yet to be found.

---

#### ART. VII.—MASON'S MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

*The Faith of the Gospel: a Manual of Christian Doctrine.*

By ARTHUR JAMES MASON, B.D., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (London, 1888.)

CANON MASON has aimed at the purpose, no less important than difficult, of providing a Body of Divinity for the use of intelligent persons, whether students of theology or laymen. The task has not been suggested to him by his solitary reflections, but by his experience as a missionary; and we are well assured that in undertaking it he has rightly apprehended the wants of the Church. We feel deeply convinced that in the present wars of the faith a large and just apprehension of the actual nature of Christianity must take the place and perform the functions which in former times were discharged by books upon the evidences of religion and discussions upon the authorities, whether Scriptural or ecclesiastical, which recommend it to mankind.

Archbishop Whately was never tired of holding up to scorn Coleridge's declaration that he is weary of the name of Evidences of Christianity; that if men can but be brought to feel their want of religion they will accept it. We do not defend the terms of Coleridge's dictum. For the consciousness of a want apart from the conception of that which supplies the want may be nearly as empty a thing as the proof of a religion apart from the comprehension of its nature. Still, many thoughtful persons will now be of opinion that the philosopher was nearer the truth than the prelate; that the best evidence of religion is afforded by its correspondence to the genuine spiritual demands of our souls, and that while proofs and

testimonies of an external kind have doubtless importance in introducing religion to men, they are but subsidiary to the supreme evidence of divine origin which enables our hearts to declare how we believe, 'not because of thy saying, for we have seen Him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ.' Blessed is the work of so setting Him and His faith before men as to bring these words to their lips.

We have said also that the presentation of Christianity as it is seems destined to supersede discussions as to the seat of the authority to teach Christianity. Many a book—and many a good book—has been written to explain and to recommend the faith by assuming an authority from which there shall be no appeal, to tell us what the faith is and compel us to accept it. When authority possessed, as it did for many ages, the physical power to suppress objection, its arguments in its own support were unanswerable; it had to be submitted to, though its moral weight might suffer the more it depended upon the material. But when it comes to pass that the outward and material supports of authority are removed, and it has to lean upon spiritual and intellectual forces, the whole plan and system of teaching religion upon authority is sooner or later brought into question. We do not mean that either authority or the need of authority wholly gives way; but it greatly changes its character and finds it impossible to use the peremptory tone in which it spoke of old. It can only hope to recommend, but not to silence or coerce. It must speak like St. Paul, not as having dominion over faith, but as a helper of Christian joy, and by manifestation of the truth commend itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God. For the question arises what the proofs can be by which either Holy Scripture or the Church can demand submission from the minds to which it recommends Christianity. They must not be proofs which assume a belief in Christianity, since Christianity is the very subject which the authority is to introduce. The aversion of men to uncertainty, and the expediency of agreeing upon some authority in order to avoid interminable discussion, may for a time prevent them from pressing this query and determine them to rest in texts of Scripture or decisions of the Church as finally decisive. But their attitude of mind is transitional and insecure. Men become more and more accustomed to doubt whether the authority is indeed so supreme and infallible as is assumed. Actual instances of its insufficiency accumulate, and after having been uttered for a while only by daring spirits, come at last to be looked in the face by all



honest men. And so the nail that was fastened in a sure place becomes loosened, and that which was hung on it, if it has no other support, falls down. This discovery was made for Church authority three centuries ago, and we cannot conceal from ourselves that the authority of Scripture has suffered a very great change in our own generation. It is the dismay of many pious souls; yet we not only hold that Christianity will survive the discovery that the earthly authority on which it was supposed to depend was not absolute or infallible, but that the change will not even be so great as was imagined.

In civil government the supreme and absolute authority of the king was long supposed to be the only security for order and obedience. It was disproved, defeated and withdrawn; yet order and obedience have not perished. Authority in the State now rests, in part at all events, upon that which it was formerly thought anomalous to admit into the question: free choice exercised by subjects as to the measures which they will accept from authority and a perception upon their part that the rule to which they submit is the representative of their own maturest preferences. When from such a condition of politics we look back upon the period when kings were nominally absolute and people nominally passive, we find that though this was the theory it was much impaired in fact, and that subjects did not yield to their kings a more unquestioning submission than now; only then their self-assertion was as it were illegitimate, while now it is justified by the theory of the law.

And it is much the same in things ecclesiastical. Although in the days when the Church was absolute, private opinions and popular impulses were supposed to have no place, yet in point of fact, they had place, and in real truth guided the authority which pretended to guide them. And when Holy Scripture had succeeded to the seat of infallibility, and a text was the sufficient proof of either a doctrine or a fact, the texts were chosen and explained according to the desires and prepossessions of the minds which were supposed to be their humble servants.

If this was so, can we think that it will make a revolution if we honestly and openly admit the claim of the human intellect and conscience to judge, not merely of the validity of an authority to which it is afterwards to submit without question, but also of the subject-matter of the revelation which the authority communicates? We hold that, on the contrary, not merely belief in revelation, but also reverence

for authority may well survive the change. To rule over free men is the glory of a king, and to be loved and revered by minds which seek and accept truth from all quarters, and are not afraid to criticize their authority itself, is a grander position, either for the Church or the Bible, than that of an authority which even because it is unquestioned is unproved.

But be we right or wrong in looking forward without dismay to the future of Christianity in an age of universal enquiry, it is certain that the change is upon us, and we may as well wish for the days of the Heptarchy as for the return of the time when the best minds among our people could accept our doctrines upon authority without question as to their inherent worthiness.

It is for this reason that we consider Canon Mason to deserve the gratitude of all Christians for his excellent book. It is meant to furnish for Christianity that which nearly every science possesses—a convenient handbook in which the first principles of the subject are stated with sufficient fulness to place it well before the mind of an intelligent reader, and with enough of proof to recommend it to his acceptance.

But the attempt involves difficulties which could hardly be expected to have been quite overcome. In the first place, there is the difficulty of deciding how deep the theology of the work is to be. If it is to bring out the whole correspondence of the Christian system with the highest human reason and the widest human experience, it must not be a superficial statement adapted to the wants of the general reader. On the other hand, if the theology both of Scripture and of the Church is to be opened up in all its depth, with all its correspondences to the development of the human mind and conscience, its consistency with itself, its power of incorporating scientific and philosophical progress, and the strong barrier which it sets up against the subtlest as well as against the more vulgar forms of disbelief, it is certain that many pages of the work will be beyond the reach even of thinkers of fair ability who have not been specially trained. We cannot quite say that Canon Mason has in all cases hit the exact mean between popular writing and over subtlety; but he has assayed the task with great ability, and with as much success as the arduous nature of the design permitted.

A second pitfall is found in the difficulty of deciding how much existing belief our Body of Divinity shall assume in those who read it. Shall it be written for those who are already Christians and only require to know the certainty of those things wherein they have been instructed; or for those

whose faith is unformed or wavering and who need that everything should be placed before them in the most persuasive light. Canon Mason states the problem in his preface.

'Dogmatic Theology lies very near in its purpose to Apologetics. Its object is, not merely to state in orthodox language the sum of what is to be believed, but to commend what it states by showing its inherent reasonableness. At the same time it differs from Apologetics inasmuch as it assumes that the student is already a believer and only needs to have his mind cleared and his faith made explicit.'

A fair statement of the case, but difficult to apply in practice. For if the account of Christian dogma is to be complete it will not omit any part, whether of the first principles or the superstructure, of that which offers itself to human faith. And then the question will occur, whether a portion of the statement—namely, that concerning first principles—is to be laid down without proof while the apologetic tinge is to be reserved for those subsequent parts which concern the special applications of the principles and the more advanced articles of the faith. Or is the whole Christian creed to be expounded in the same tone and method at the risk of repeating for many that which they already know and proving that of which they are already convinced? The opening sentences of Canon Mason's work itself seem to us to show that it is not easy to get over this difficulty. For it commences by declaring that it is not the business of an expounder of Christian doctrine to prove the existence of God. If this were so, it is certain that his exposition would fail in apologetic effect just at the point where in these days of ours apologetics are most needed. The being of a God is not, as was once the case, a principle doubted by so few that it may be assumed without thereby ignoring any widespread intellectual wants. On the contrary, the being of a God is in these days so common a subject of denial that whoever doubts at all is sure sooner or later to doubt it. And if the existence of God remained unexpounded or the exposition were left without any of that admixture of defence which, as Canon Mason truly says, careful exposition naturally takes, it is certain that much of the timely usefulness of the book would be lost.

Happily the pages immediately succeeding prove that Canon Mason does not consider the proof of the existence of God so entirely beyond his province as his opening words imply. For he immediately follows them up by expressing a doubt whether the proof of God's existence which he disclaims giving can really be given at all: 'if we follow the

guidance of Holy Scripture we shall not be led to expect that God's existence can be demonstrated like a problem in mathematics.' It is a just and well-founded observation. But if God's existence cannot be demonstrated, how is it that men become convinced of it? And when other men doubt of it, what way is left to the Church of convincing them? No doubt the answer to both questions is found in the fact that, while demonstration is impossible, there is such a conformity in the belief of a God to the instinctive exercise of man's reason and of his practical faculties, that the idea needs but to be fairly placed before him, cleared from difficulties and objection, in order to secure his adherence to it. And this is the very thing which Canon Mason proceeds with great ability to do.

In fact we do not see why a book like this should presume anything or give any intimation that it is addressed to believers more than to unbelievers. It is an exposition of the faith of the Gospel in its elements and in its results, written throughout upon the principle of offering to the doubter and believer alike the most truthful presentation of Christian belief that can be given. As in the case of other books, men will decide for themselves whether the volume suits their wants or not. And it will be a wholesome thing for the writer to remember throughout all his task that he may be speaking to the critical as well as to the acquiescent.

And this leads us to the third and most formidable difficulty which the writer of such a book has to face. The very nature of the work implies that the day is past when first the proof of an authority and then the extraction from records of what the authority teaches were the proper stages in displaying and recommending the Christian creed. The Christian faith is in this book presented to men upon its own merits. Although both texts and Church decision are liberally quoted, neither are rested on as absolute proofs of truth. Far down among the articles of the faith comes the mention of the inspiration of Scripture and of the divine commission to the Church—the doctrines which should have been first laid down and demonstrated if it were upon authority that the faith was to be recommended. Nor is the actual definition of the inspiration of Scripture or that of the powers of the Church such as would suffice to bear the weight which in former times was laid upon them. Not that their authority is surrendered, but it is much modified, and appears rather as a deduction from tenets previously established than as itself a foundation of belief.

Now this is a new thing in Church history. It is, we

suppose, the first time during these later days in which an elaborate statement of the contents of Christian theology has been presented to the world so much on its own merits. New in these later days, we say, but not without example in the earlier. For this is the very way in which the faith of the Gospel was preached in Apostolic times: with illustrative citation of authorities, indeed, both in the Old Testament Scriptures and in the Apostolic testimony, yet not throwing itself upon authority, but on its own inherent power and on the response which human souls framed by God will make to His message if they allow nature to speak within them.

Now it must be the care of the author of such a work to determine how much of the ancient presentations of Christianity he can retain in an exposition designed to display the inherent reasonableness of the creed and not its literal agreement with authority. We find that the conception of Holy Scripture as verbally infallible on all subjects has led us wrong. Holy Scripture has been proved to have a human element in it, and to set many facts before us not as they literally were, but in a partial aspect adapted to the time in which it was written. Such, for instance, is the discovery we have made as to the Scripture accounts of primitive man. Canon Mason entirely recognizes this. We find him conceiving the possibility that more points of origin than one for the human race, without fatal injury to Christian belief, may be one day proved. We entirely agree; but this is to say that the letter of Scripture is an insufficient authority. Now it is plain that a discovery of this sort cannot be restricted to the single point in question. It must change our whole conception of the nature of the authority.

In recognition of this change a representation of the faith of the Gospel is framed in which Holy Scripture appears, not as a solitary source of divine instruction, but as one out of a number of means by the concurrence of which man's reason, feeling and conscience are to be appealed to for Christ. And the question inevitably arises, what are we to do with those ideas which held their places in the faith only by acceptance of a theory concerning Scripture which to the minds of our time is essentially impaired? We shall give an instance as a specimen of many—the nature of angels. When information derived from Scripture is believed to come direct from God without the infusion of a human element, every text in which angels are mentioned will seem as decisive a source of information concerning them as observations in natural history are concerning animals. But if any suspicion of relativity in the

Scripture account of things be admitted ; any surmise that things are there displayed to us not as they are but as they present themselves to men of a particular time, our confidence at once receives a check. Our belief that there are angels and that they minister among men may remain ; the combination of Scripture, Church and reason will suffice for that. But the more particulars we go into, the further we wander beyond human experience and that which concerns man, the more uncertain we must feel of our ground. We confess that the confidence of our assent flags when we are assured that the very angels who govern the universe are 'only temporary regents on man's behalf,' 'tutors,' and 'stewards' (Gal. iv. 2); that 'they have not man's interminable spring of progress in themselves ; and, therefore, mighty as they are, it is not to them that God has "subjected the world to come," but to that being whom even now in his weakness God deigns to visit so graciously and so richly' (Heb. ii. 5, 6 ; p. 79). We know what these texts say, but other explanations of them are possible, and even were it otherwise we do not feel so sure that they are so untinged by relativity as to build on them, without some misgiving, the conception of a race of beings so different from the rest of God's creation as not to have in themselves an interminable spring of progress. And, indeed, Canon Mason himself does not speak as one assured of his footing. For he says that :—

'Some Christian thinkers go so far as actually to identify these' [the great moulding influences of which we speak under such terms as the 'spirit of the age' or 'national character'] 'with the angelic agencies, at the cost, as it would seem, of the personal consciousness and will of the angels. Our acquaintance with the nature of pure spirits is so slight that we may hardly deny the theory ; but the personal names given to some of the blessed angels appear to teach that some, at any rate, are more than vague and semi-conscious influences' (p. 73).

Were we to attempt to lay down any test by which to determine what portion of that which has been believed in the name of Christianity shall retain its place in a treatise which exhibits to a sceptical age the absolutely certain and essential features of the Christian faith, our standard would be found in a broad application of St. Vincent's rule. No doctrines should be laid down as certainly appertaining to the body of Christianity which rest on single texts of Scripture, or have not belonged to that essential form of the faith in the strength of which its spiritual conquests were made always, everywhere, and by all.

And the principle would seem to us in agreement with



the views concerning Scripture and the Church which Canon Mason lays down (p. 233 *sq.*). But perhaps we may hazard this criticism, that the more close he comes to the concerns of human life and experience the better his work. In the more abstract portions, and those which are far from our experience, we sometimes find ourselves doubting. But when from such things as the Being and Nature of God and the angels he comes down to the Incarnation and Atonement of our Lord, we feel an immediate sense of his mastery of the subject.

We doubt if the human intellect be capable of really feeling the validity of such reasoning as this.

'God must be ever inwardly projected, reproduced; or rather projecting, reproducing Himself; not by a succession of fresh reproductions, for we have no right to say that with God there is any succession, but by one act of reproduction, complete and abiding yet ever new, as if the one act were always in the living process of being performed. Thus there must ever confront Him somewhat which is at once Himself and not Himself, which He can regard as embodying His whole being, while still (in a sense) separate from, and contrasted with, that which in the first instance is the "I," the "Ego," of God' (p. 44).

Our faculties enable us to know that which is our own daily experience, the projection of the Ego beyond itself for the purpose of self-realization in thought. But we fear we must confess ourselves unable to grasp this self-contemplation as the source of a second personality; of the object becoming a new subject while the subject is object as well. We could perhaps grasp the argument that when we transfer our own mental experience to a perfect and infinite Being we must substitute for the mere thought by which we imperfectly represent ourselves to ourselves, an act issuing in a reality—if we had never known the existence of any reality external to God except one as perfect as Himself. But our whole calculations as to what in a perfect being corresponds to the processes of thought and action in an imperfect one are disturbed by the existence in the presence of this perfect being of an imperfect world. We never could have presumed *à priori* the possibility of such a thing. We should have supposed that God could not think, or, what in Him is perhaps the same, could not produce, anything less perfect than Himself. But must we not, unless we would set God apart from the world and from ourselves and render access to Him impossible, lay down the fact that God thinks the finite world, and that the finite world exists objectively to Him? And if we know this in

fact, how can we fall back with any degree of confidence upon abstract arguments as to the real and perfect nature of the thoughts of God? We can know nothing about it except by revelation—by which word we mean, not merely the Bible, but all and any of the facts in the finite world, whether that of nature or that of man, by which we are led beyond the finite to the Infinite.

What we do seem to be able to say, with confidence that we are not passing beyond our measure, is this—that we know in our experience the existence of a separate personality, with nothing outside of it, to be impossible. Man's existence would become a nonentity and cease to be real existence at all, unless there were something not himself by acting on which he proves his living power to himself. When we are led by the necessities of our nature and the experience of life and history up to God, it comes to us as a welcome correspondence between the mystery within ourselves and the mystery from which we issue, that there, too, we should hear of the same trinity which we find in ourselves—the original self, the self as developed in thought and action, and the mysterious bond which unites the two.

But if we find that in Canon Mason's abstract reasonings, able as they are, there is anything which we cannot absolutely follow, it is far otherwise when he comes to consider the nature of man in itself, in its experience, and in its relations to the world and to God. He bases his representation upon the recognition of all which science teaches, even upon the admission that science may have further teaching still in store. 'Evolution,' he says (and Professor Huxley will not contradict him), 'lends itself perfectly to Christian teleology. When we hear of an evolution which is an advance from a ruder economy to a more delicate, which adapts things more and more to their surroundings, and the surroundings to the things, then it seems to us that matter and force must be instruments in the hand of One who has an object in view' (p. 8). Organic Life had a beginning, and the question is, How did it begin? Now we are confirmed by the researches of science in supposing 'that there is no such thing as spontaneous generation.' But we shall perhaps have the assent of Canon Mason if we add that even if what is called spontaneous generation were discovered to take place, the fact would not be at all fatal to our belief in God. We do not in the least allow that the progress of evolution since life was introduced has been spontaneous in the sense of taking place without the hand of God. And if a creature having life could be proved

to have issued from a stone as a chick does from an egg, we should not consider this a spontaneous act either of the stone or the chick, any more than we consider the same creature as the spontaneous production of the egg. We should call it a wonderful and hitherto undiscovered tendency impressed on the original atoms by the Power which fashioned them. And at the same time we should confess that the conception of God as endowing matter with certain qualities, and then leaving it to go on of itself, is a merely human way of looking at things, and that in reality God must be present and acting all along, and acting at every successive point as truly as in the first.

Human self-consciousness is another stage in advance, a stage which seems to some thinkers more important and more distinct than the step from dead matter to life. We find it as much beyond us to prove or even imagine the possibility of a spontaneous transition from the mental life of the lower animals to the self-consciousness of man, as we do to imagine a spontaneous transition from a stone to life. To be sure, this representation of human self-consciousness is doubted by many metaphysicians, who hold that the knowledge which man has of himself is only of the same nature which he has of outward things, a higher degree of the same intelligence which we see in the brutes. We entirely disagree with these views, and we hold that Canon Mason by no means exaggerates the distinctness of man's mental character. But we remark as before, that even if the self-consciousness of man could be proved to be developed out of the intelligence of brutes, we should only see in that an additional testimony of the far-reaching wisdom of the Father of all, who has so framed lower intelligence as to change into that which is infinitely higher.

The spirit in man is the element of self-consciousness and freedom. By it we see our true relation to the things of sense and are able to claim affinities above them (p. 83), and 'man is a dual being living at once in two worlds, not two separate lives, but one life in the two.' This language will, of course, seem to the materialist strained and unreal; for him man has but one life, and that of the lowest connexions. But we are well convinced that the truth about the wonderful constitution of human nature and about its experience can never be stated except in paradoxes such as Canon Mason resorts to; and that those who make their theory simple only make it false.

The account of the fall in Genesis seems to Mr. Mason full of difficulties. And full of them we allow it to be if there

be still persons who find a difficulty in the concession which he proceeds to make, that the facts are presented to us partly under an allegorical shape. To us, we confess, this circumstance does not bring any difficulty at all, nor do we require the help of the word 'partly' to soften the force of the admission. In fact, we almost wonder now at the perverse notion of the conditions of the Bible revelation which ever made anybody think that the narrative was otherwise than allegorical: whether the allegory of a vision springing up by God's influence in the mind of a seer, or an allegory fashioned by the inspired insight of a race to whom God was committing the task of teaching the world to know Him.

But we must hasten forward to the chapters to which this subject naturally leads—those which treat of the Incarnation and of the saving work of Christ. In these we think Canon Mason appears at his very best. Neither the theologian nor the practical Christian can fail to derive plentiful help and instruction from the thought instinct with love which he has expended upon this central portion of his design. The basis is laid in the Preparation of the Gospel among the Jews (pp. 106-112) and among the Gentiles (p. 113). The misconceptions which have at various times clouded the appreciation of the great truth that Jesus Christ and He alone is perfect God and perfect man are successively expounded and set aside. And first among them stands the novel Roman doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of His Blessed Mother. It is shown from St. Bernard that the Blessed Virgin herself is but poorly honoured by a doctrine which shares with her own mother the unique honour which belongs to the conception of her Holy Child. But a far more anti-Christian feature of it is that it takes away the prerogative of our Saviour Himself. 'The Lord Jesus alone,' argues St. Bernard, 'was conceived by the Holy Ghost, because He alone was holy before His conception.' 'Not only does the doctrine make the Blessed Virgin herself exempt from original sin, and therefore exempt from the common need of salvation, but by so doing it insulates our Lord Himself from direct touch with the sinful world' (p. 117). Such is Canon Mason's powerful criticism on this novelty, and we believe him entirely in the right. There have been many heresies concerning the Lord's own nature, but there is none of them which has a more direct tendency to confuse the simplicity of man's trust in Him than this Roman error. There can be no stronger evidence of the sceptical indifference to truth which has overspread the Church which professes to set a special value on dogma than the submission with which such a

novelty was received by the mass of the Roman communion. We may look back with regret upon the virulence of dispute which accompanied the controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries. But at least there was something more edifying in even a passionate carefulness about correctness in the loftiest matters than in a tame willingness that anything which pleases the rulers should be asserted in the things of heaven so long as the earthly course of the Church's habit goes on without a break.

We commend the section in which Canon Mason treats of the impersonality of our Lord's human nature as an instance of his ability in making conceptions which are not only obscure but capable of erroneous meanings become clear and comprehensible. We do not think we have ever read any exposition of the Catholic doctrine of the Saviour's Person which makes so plain to every reader of intelligence and piety the spiritual importance of tenets which appear over-subtle to those who look on them from without. We wish that we had space to give a full account of these chapters, but we hasten on to the great theme which follows—the salvation of man.

The heading of page 147—'Affinity of the Word for Creation'—true though the idea be which it expresses, yet appears to be a misprint, since the affinity of the Word for Incarnation is the subject of the page: a wonderful and ennobling view of human destiny for which the authority of St. Athanasius is invoked. 'It is no strange thing if the Word who orders all things and gives life to all things, and who willed a revelation to come through men, has used a human body for the manifestation of the truth and making known of the Father.' Canon Mason matches this deep thought of the primitive theologian with an answering thought from modern science. For if that which we know of God displays to us in Him what we may call a tendency man-wards, so that which we know of man displays a tendency God-wards.

'Enough is already certain [in the doctrine of Evolution] to convince us that there has been an onward and upward movement in created things. The inorganic, the organic, the sentient, have prepared for the rational. Man recapitulates them in himself, and takes authority over them. But must the evolution stop there? Here is a being capable of knowing and loving God; a being like to God and with a heart restless until it rests in Him; a being capable (as we know now by blessed experience) of appreciating an Incarnation. Can we imagine that it was not intended to receive it and was not made for the purpose?' (p. 148).

We can imagine that many will regard this conception of spiritual evolution to be dreamy and deficient in proof in

comparison with the definite theory of Darwin and its visible and tangible evidences. But to us it seems that the spiritual side of man affords as real a field of observation, and his religious history as real facts as any of those which the physical world has to furnish.

'We are permitted, therefore, to perceive that the Incarnation and Death of Christ have actually brought us blessings far wider than the removal of sin' (p. 151). But this belief does not seem to Canon Mason, as it has seemed to some other theologians, to draw with it the conclusion that Adam's sin was a *felix culpa*, and that 'we have to thank Adam for drawing down to us by his sin One who was so much more to us than a redeemer. The facts seem to be against such a theory. We can hardly think that God would have punished the race for loyalty to its Maker by withholding what now He has bestowed, and what He always knew Himself able to bestow' (p. 152). To some it may seem a matter of slight importance to decide whether the Incarnation would have taken place had there been no human sin: because the fact actually is that human sin does exist, and the Incarnation with all its saving consequences must be viewed and used by man as a sinful being. But man, though a sinful being, is not merely a sinful being. He is also made in God's image; and God's image is the deepest thing in his nature. If Christ had only relieved him of his sin, He would not have given free scope to those aspirations after positive righteousness and communion with God which lie obscured by sin in the unredeemed man, but which are in themselves more powerful as well as worthier demands than those of the sinner for forgiveness. But there is that in the Saviour which satisfies the wants of the most saintly souls as much as of the most despairing sinners in this world, and will satisfy them throughout an existence in which sin will have been left far behind as a passing misery of this short life.

Canon Mason lays down a true and fruitful principle when he says that 'in considering the redemptive work of our Lord Jesus Christ, the human conscience demands that the theory of it should be simple. No one can rest with confidence upon what is, on the face of it, an artifice, a scheme' (p. 155). It would seem axiomatic that the gospel must be something which the simplest believer in Jesus Christ during the time of His earthly ministry must have implicitly understood. The belief which brought a man or woman to His feet in trust and adherence was ever saluted by Him as saving faith. His death and resurrection added reasons for such a faith, afforded



helps to gain and maintain it, and infinitely enlarged its scope. But if saving faith had been only possible when exercised in relation to these great events, the Lord would have put off the time for demanding faith and for promising a reward to it until after He should have died and risen again.

It seems to us that the simplicity of the faith consists in the fact that faith in Christ is the same which we daily place in one another, with the additions and enlargements which naturally flow from the greatness of His Person, and of the work which He performs. No simpler description than this can be imagined, because it is not only easy to understand, but even comes by instinct and experience to the most ignorant without any necessity, or the consciousness of any necessity, to understand it at all.

The human race are bound up in one by the conditions of their existence. Their solidarity is not a doctrine but a fact. 'No man liveth to himself and no man dieth to himself' is a great truth, even if we do not believe that it is to the Lord we live and die. Neither our thinking nor our working can be done in solitude. All acts of our mind or life derive their conditions from the existence of others of our race around us, and constitute in their turn conditions under which others are to think and live. When individuals succeed or fail, masses succeed or fail in them. Nothing can be more false than to Socinianize human life by refusing the confession of our mutual dependence, or by limiting it to the power of mutual example. Example is something indeed, but it falls in only as one item in a vast system of reciprocal action whereby what men do affects their fellows *ex opere operato*. Their sins and their virtues are imputed by nature to others beside themselves. For the misdeeds of one, another is sacrificed. By the self-devotion of one, multitudes are benefited. There is not one of the terms of the Christian doctrine of the work of Christ which has not a meaning when applied to the benefits and the sufferings which pass from man to man in the common experience of life. The difference between His bearing relations to them, and theirs to each other, in sin-bearing and the imputation of merit, does not lie in the completeness of the attribution on either side, but upon the degree in which His sacrifice affects that which all sacrifice aims at, and in the perfection with which His will consented to His self-devotion. Even in these particulars something is attained by human nature of itself, even though it falls infinitely short of Him. History is full of narratives of self-sacrifice, either realized in actual fact or invented by men to

show what it is that they consider possible and praiseworthy in their race. And patriots and martyrs have not died for nothing. They have saved lives, delivered nations, uplifted the souls of millions, by their devotion.

And yet, after all, they have but saved lives which after a time must be lost again in the course of nature; they have wrought but partial and temporary deliverances for their people, and their power upon souls has been but small in comparison to the downward impulse of the world. He alone can bear human sin in the full sense, who can bear it away; He alone overcomes the enemies of man who overcomes death; and He alone can uplift the human soul who can live for it and in it, and that for ever. Men do not need any theories about His work to draw them to Him. They need but to reflect what their human life aims at though it never attains; what they strive to do for one another but are never able to accomplish; what human nature shows of a divine inspiration behind it without ever fully revealing it to us except in the one life of the Christ of God.

We are in agreement with Canon Mason in thinking that the same demand for simplicity is valid regarding that ordinance in which the work of Christ is ever manifestly set forth before the Church by God, and before God by the Church. In the Holy Eucharist, he well says, 'the living grasp of the personal Christ' is the one great necessity without which correctness of doctrine is of little worth. But alas! if it be possible that even the most correct doctrines should be mentally held without producing the spiritual impulse to union with the personal Christ, it is also true that incorrectness of doctrine has a grievous power to hinder this personal union. We do not doubt that in multitudes the sound feeling overcomes the erroneous doctrine; but in multitudes more the erroneous doctrine succeeds in stifling the feeling, and by leading them to expect nothing helps them to get nothing. The enjoyment of earthly affection can be interfered with to a terrible degree by wrong notions taken into the mind about the blessings which our affection has to hope for from its object; and so it may be in the heavenly. Therefore it is well that, having guarded himself against the supposition that correct doctrine on the Eucharist is the primary condition of enjoying its benefits, Canon Mason proceeds to a careful consideration of the doctrine, and one which, after all that has been argued during the long ages of Eucharistic controversy, the thoughtful reader cannot but find fresh and suggestive.

But we must conclude our review, which will have had

the effect we desire only if it prevails upon our readers to master the work for themselves. As we close its pages we reflect how rich an exercise for the human powers, and how magnificent a working hypothesis for human life, a religion such as is here presented to us has to offer. There is here no restriction, such as some imagine religion to imply, on the freest and widest exertion of the intellect. It is not possible to imagine what faculty of man or what healthful exertion of any of his faculties there can be which is excluded from so broad a field. Certainly science affords no richer opportunity and no more abundant material to man's mind than religion so understood. And there are other parts of man's nature as truly belonging to him as his intellect, which science starves, but which have here full scope and encouragement. His feelings, his affections, his moral nature, full as they are of aspirations that cannot be squared to fit a scientific frame, are here trained for eternal uses. The past history of mankind, from which existing man cannot sever himself, appears here, not as a record of error which it is the business of a reasonable man utterly to cast off and despise, but as a story of progress under the eye of God, by which man is taught what his nature is and what it needs. And none of the spiritual lessons which that great sad history teaches, in any country or in any age, fail here to find their place.

Theology was once the queen of sciences. Those who called her so had not yet a full conception of the meaning of their claim. Like Cæsar, who imagined he had reduced Gaul to order while still there remained a stronger confederacy to be overcome than any which he had subdued, religion supposed itself victorious while the materials of a vast revolt still existed in human nature. But Cæsar did not mistake his destiny. He stood supreme at last, not by exterminating his enemies, but by organizing them into a great system which gave them truer freedom and a wider exercise for their gifts than they could have procured for themselves. And so the faith of the Gospel may triumph at last, not by extinguishing the knowledge which now arrays itself against her, but by enlisting it in her service and affording it a nobler scope than it could find beyond her. It is not given to any one man absolutely to set religion in this comprehensive aspect: that is the work, not of an individual, but of the Church, and of the Church in many generations of her life. But we truly believe that no one in our time has shown better than the author of this book how deeply the Christian faith has struck its roots in every department of human nature and human experience.

# ART. VIII.—THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS.

1. *A Commentary on the two Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians.* By the late Rev. W. KAY, D.D. (London, 1887.)
2. *St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, with a Critical and Grammatical Commentary.* By CHARLES J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. (London, 1887.)
3. *Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians.* By F. GODET, Doctor of Theology, &c. 2 vols. Translated from the French by Rev. A. CUSIN, M.A., Edinburgh. (Edinburgh, 1886-7.)

THE First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians is one which has very many special points of interest connected with it, and which offers to a careful student of Holy Scripture and of Ecclesiastical History a peculiarly rich field for profitable investigation. Before we invite our readers' attention to some of the recent Commentaries on this Epistle, we propose to consider a few of its most notable features, thinking that though to many they are very familiar, they cannot be too often recalled to mind, as having power to strengthen our faith, and to make us more appreciative of the historical and doctrinal value of this sacred document, and of the teaching and practice of our own Church as being in general harmony with that which was taught and approved by the Inspired Writer of it.

In the first place it must be noted that this is one of those Epistles which is universally, or almost universally, admitted even by those critics who refuse to recognize St. Paul as the author of many of the letters attributed to him, to have been written by the apostle, whose name it bears. Baur (representing the Tübingen School), in a passage quoted by Godet in the introduction to his Commentary (p. 12), allows that

'it carries the seal of its authenticity in itself; for more than any other writing of the New Testament it transports us into the living centre of a Christian Church in formation, and procures for us a view of the circumstances through which the development of the new life evoked by Christianity had to pass.'

External and internal evidence alike have in this case brought critics of various schools of criticism to the same conclusion.

Secondly, there can be scarcely any doubt as to the

place where and the time when this Epistle was written by St. Paul. It is indeed strange that in the subscription to the Epistle in our Authorized Version and in some other versions, and also in certain manuscripts, it should be stated that the letter was written from Philippi. This error has most probably arisen from a misunderstanding of chap. xvi. ver. 5, 'I pass through Macedonia.' The words in ver. 8 of the same chapter, combined with ver. 19 and xv. 32, appear to render it a matter of almost perfect certainty that when St. Paul wrote this letter to the Church, of which, 'as a wise master-builder, he had laid the foundation' (iii. 10) in the then foremost commercial city in Greece, and the capital of the Roman province of Achaia, he was sojourning in the equally famous and wealthy capital of the Roman province of Asia. At Ephesus, as we learn from the Acts of the Apostles, he spent between two and three years in his third missionary journey, and from the language which he uses in this Epistle we may naturally infer that it is to the close of that period of his life, probably the year A.D. 57, that the date of the letter must be assigned. Certain expressions in the Epistle (v. 7, &c., compared with xvi. 8) have led many to suppose, not without good reason, that the season of the year in which it was written was about Eastertide, or between Easter and Pentecost, or Whitsuntide.

Again, the circumstances which led to the Epistle being written are clearly brought before us in the Epistle itself. A letter had been sent from the Corinthian Church to the Apostle, asking for his advice and direction upon certain important questions, in respect of which there were great differences of opinion and diversities of action. To the consideration of these questions a large portion of the Epistle is devoted; but the Apostle takes the opportunity for referring to many other matters on which his opinion had not been asked, and especially to some very flagrant evils and very erroneous views which were vitally affecting the wellbeing and the faith of the Church. Hence the variety of subjects with which St. Paul deals in this the longest save one of all his Epistles is peculiarly great, and though some of those subjects in themselves may be regarded as having but comparatively little practical interest for our own times, yet the manner in which St. Paul treats them, and the principles which he lays down in discussing them, can never lose their force, and may equally well be applied to other subjects of controversy and other forms of evil than those which were prevalent in the Church of Corinth at one particular period of its history.

But the point which we desire specially to bring before our readers is this—that we believe it to be simply impossible to overrate the historical and evidential value of this Epistle as regards (1) the Incarnation, the Life and Death, and Resurrection of our Lord ; (2) the circumstances of the author's own life, and the grounds of his belief in those facts ; (3) the faith, and practice, and worship of the Primitive Church, or at least of one leading European branch of it ; (4) the especial prominence given to the two Holy Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself as the highest and most sacred of all means of grace.

(1) If, as we have seen, it is generally admitted that this Epistle is a genuine writing of St. Paul, and if, as we have also seen, there is every reason for believing that it was written during the Apostle's third missionary journey, towards the close of his residence in the city of Ephesus, about 57 A.D., less than thirty years had passed since Jesus of Nazareth was living on earth, when one of His Apostles sent this letter to the members of one of the foremost among the Churches which had then been founded. And surely it is most remarkable that in this letter, more than in any other of the letters of St. Paul or of the Epistles written by other writers of the New Testament, there should be such constant and varied references to particular incidents and circumstances connected with the life and teaching of Him who had so recently been taken from the world, but whom the writer believed to be alive for evermore, and to be coming hereafter to judge the living and the dead. Not only does the writer habitually speak of Him who 'was the Son of God, and the Lord of the Corinthians and himself and of all that in every place call upon His name' (i. 9, 2), as having the personal name of Jesus, and as being the Christ, or Messiah, who was to come into the world (i. 1 &c.), but he also refers to those who were known as 'the Brethren of the Lord' (ix. 5), to His Apostles or 'the Twelve' (xv. 5), and among them to Cephas or Peter (i. 12, iii. 22, xv. 5), to James, probably one of His brethren (xv. 7), and to the fact of His having more than 500 disciples gathered together at one time (xv. 6). He mentions also His being betrayed by night (xi. 23), His death by crucifixion (i. 17, 23, &c.), the rulers of this world being those who in their ignorance crucified Him (ii. 8), His burial (xv. 4), His resurrection from the dead (xv. *passim*), and His appearances after His resurrection on many occasions to His Apostles and disciples, many of whom were yet living (xv. 5, &c.), while he also describes minutely the



institution of the 'Lord's Supper' on the night in which He was to be betrayed (xi. 23). Some of the arguments which the Apostle uses in the course of his letter are also founded upon the teaching of Jesus Christ when He was living among men. He specially refers to the command which Jesus had given that those who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel (ix. 14, compared with St. Matt. x. 10, and St. Luke, x. 7), and to the declaration which He had made in respect of holy matrimony, that 'the husband was not to put away his wife, nor the wife her husband' (vii. 10, 11, compared with St. Mark x. 11, 12). Have we not in these references a short 'Gospel in an Epistle,' and a brief outline of some of the principal facts connected with the Incarnation and earthly life of the Son of God, in perfect accordance with the fuller accounts which were to be given by St. Luke and St. Mark, the friends and fellow-labourers of St. Paul, and by their brother Evangelists, St. Matthew and St. John?

(2) Again, as regards the author himself, even if we had no other evidence beyond that which the letter supplies, we should learn from it that the writer was a certain Paul (i. 1, &c.), a Jew by race (x. 1), and well instructed in the Hebrew Scriptures (x. 1, &c.), who had been at one time a persecutor of the Church of God (xv. 9), but who had been, as he believed, by the will and grace of God, called to be an Apostle of Jesus Christ (i. 1 &c.), Whom he had seen (ix. 1) after His resurrection (xv. 8), and from Whom he had received special revelations (xi. 23, xv. 3). We should also know that among his fellow-labourers were included a certain Barnabas (ix. 6); an Apollos who had succeeded him at Corinth, 'watering' where he himself had 'planted' (iii. 6), and having great influence over many members of the Corinthian Church (i. 12 &c.); a Timothy, 'his beloved child' in the faith (iv. 17), who was coming to them (xvi. 10); and Aquila and Priscilla, who were evidently well known by them (xvi. 19), and that among the few whom he personally baptized was one Crispus by name (i. 15). We should further gather from the expressions which the writer uses that even though he was an Apostle he had worked with his own hands at some earthly trade when he was at Corinth and elsewhere (ix. 6, 12; iv. 12), that he might not become in any way burdensome to those to whom he ministered, or be thought to be under the influence of any mercenary motive, though he claimed full right for himself and for other ministers of Christ to be supported by the Church in accordance with the teaching of Jesus Himself (ix. 6 &c.). Lastly,

we should know that the writer, who had once persecuted others, had with his brother Apostles suffered much persecution (xv. 30, 31, 32; xvi. 9; iv. 9 &c.); that he was closely connected with the Churches of Galatia (xvi. 1); that he was about to cross into Macedonia, after leaving Ephesus (xvi. 5); and that when he had spent the winter at Corinth (xvi. 6), and had received the contributions which had been made for the poor saints at Jerusalem, he would most probably go up to that city, accompanying those to whom the contributions would be entrusted, with the approval of the Corinthians (xvi. 3, 4, &c.). It is unnecessary to point out how perfectly consistent these incidental notices in the Epistle are with the accounts preserved in the Acts of the Apostles (see especially xviii. 2 &c.; xix. 27 &c.; xx. 1 &c.), 'everything,' as Schleiermacher has said, 'fitting in, yet in such a way that each of the documents follows its own course, and the facts contained in the one cannot be borrowed from those of the other' (quoted by Godet, Introduction, p. 12).

(3) In respect of the faith and customs of the Church in Apostolic times, how full and how precious is the information which this one Epistle contains! Can we doubt, as we read the words and take them in their natural meaning, that the faith of the Apostle and of the true members of the Church included a belief in the three Persons of the one Godhead (see especially xii. 3-6); in the death of Jesus Christ on the Cross being a sacrifice for or in behalf of the sins of the world, as that of the true Paschal Lamb (xv. 3, v. 7); in the life-giving efficacy of His resurrection from the dead (xv. 45); in the future bodily rising again in Christ of those who in Adam naturally die (xv. 21, 22); and in the final judgment of the world by the same Lord who had once died for its sins (xv. 17), and Who, when He came again, would 'bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the hearts' (iv. 5). In the fifteenth chapter, 1-3, we seem to have, as Dean Stanley says, 'the earliest known specimen of what may be called the Creed of the Early Church'; and, short though it is, how much is really comprised within it! and how clearly do we see from the language which the Apostle uses that he was fully persuaded that on the belief in the death, the burial, and the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ according to the Scriptures, rested the whole superstructure of Christian faith and Christian hope!

When we try to gather from the Epistle some knowledge as to the worship and public ceremonies and ritual of the Church, we find, more clearly than in any other book of the

N  
of  
pra  
by  
con  
of t  
the  
all  
(xi.  
rev  
find  
thei  
and  
(xi.  
two  
be d  
Las  
mar  
on v  
had  
(  
cust  
sure  
Sacr  
Him  
state  
Sacr  
muc  
by o  
of gr  
is no  
Epis  
how  
was  
'thou  
of th  
went  
figur  
belie  
receiv  
wheth  
or fro  
(xii.  
of an  
Chris

New Testament, notices of the habitual assembling together of the members of the Church for united services, of the prayers, of the singing of psalms or hymns, of the preaching by prophets specially inspired, with a view to 'edification and comfort and consolation,' of the giving of thanks, and even of the *Amens* uttered by the congregation (xiv. 26, 15, 16, 3), of the blessing of the Cup and the breaking of the Bread (x. 16), of all partaking of that one Bread (x. 16) and drinking that Cup (xi. 26), and of the 'falling down on the face,' with Eastern reverence, as the attitude of prayer (xiv. 25); while we also find St. Paul directing that in public worship men should have their heads uncovered, and women theirs veiled or covered, and that the latter should keep silence in the churches (xi. 4, 5), and finally prescribing what have been called the two rubrics of the Primitive Church—that 'all things should be done decently and in order, and unto edifying' (xiv. 26, 40). Lastly, we have notice of the first day of the week being marked out from other days, and of its being the special day on which everyone was to lay by in store, 'according as God had prospered him,' for charitable purposes (xvi. 2).

(4) But, above all the other rites and ceremonies and customs of the Church to which this Epistle refers, there surely stand out in wonderful prominence the two blessed Sacraments which we believe to have been ordained by Christ Himself as 'generally necessary to salvation.' It is sometimes stated that very little is said in the Epistles about these two Sacraments, and the inference is erroneously drawn that too much importance is attached to them by our own branch, and by other branches of the Holy Catholic Church, as special means of grace. Surely the question to be considered and answered is not how much, but what, is said respecting them. And this Epistle is a sure witness, whose testimony is sufficient to prove how inexpressible was their value in the opinion of one who was bold to say, and felt that he had a right to say, that he 'thought that he had the Spirit of God' (vii. 40). In the passing of the Israelites through the Red Sea, and in the cloud which went before them in the wilderness, St. Paul saw a type or figure of Holy Baptism (x. 1, 2). 'By the one Spirit,' as he believed, and as he reminded the Corinthians, 'all' who received Christian Baptism 'were baptized into one Body, whether they were Jews or Gentiles, whether they were bond or free, and had all been made to drink into one Spirit' (xii. 13). Baptized, not into St. Paul's name, nor into the name of any other human teacher, but into the name of Jesus Christ (i. 13 &c.), they had become members of Christ (xii. 27).

Washed, or bathed as it were by the Spirit of God (vi. 11), they had thereby become the temples of God, and were bound to keep their bodies and their souls as having been both alike dedicated as sanctuaries to God, pure and undefiled by sin (iii. 16 &c.—vi. 19).

Of the other Holy Sacrament the Apostle saw types or signs in the manna, or spiritual food, and in the water flowing from the rock, of which the Israelites had eaten and drunk in the wilderness (x. 2, 3), and he declares in this Epistle that it was by revelation from the Lord Himself that he had received the account of its Institution by Him on the night before His death (xi. 23). It is assuredly a most remarkable fact that the account which the Apostle gives of that Institution, while it very greatly resembles the narrative in St. Luke's Gospel, is in some respects, especially as regards some of the words represented to have been used by our Lord (cf. the *twice* uttered words, 'This do in remembrance of me,' xi. 24, 25), more full and complete than any of the accounts preserved in the Gospels. He also dwells upon the necessity of its being observed through all ages of the Church as a public announcing or proclamation of the Lord's death until He shall come again (xi. 26); he speaks of the Bread and Wine, when duly broken or poured into the Cup and blessed, being 'the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ' (x. 16); of the duty of often eating the Bread and drinking the Cup at the Lord's table in remembrance of Him (xi. 26, 28); of the danger of receiving them in an unworthy and irreverent spirit (xi. 27); of the need for self-examination or testing the spiritual state before partaking of them (xi. 28); and of the blessing which the reverent partaking thereof brings to those who thereby become, as it were, 'one Bread and one Body' (x. 17).

There are many other features of the Epistle which give to it a very special character and a very special value, but the space, at our disposal will not allow of our here referring to them. Enough it may be thought, or more than enough, has been said by way of remembrance to show what a precious testimony the letter gives to those historical facts which are the central truths of our own creeds, and how completely it justifies, as founded upon Apostolic authority, the sacramental teaching of our own Church and the principal features of our public worship. We cannot be too thankful that such an Epistle as this should be one to which, with the consent of those who are best qualified to judge, even of those whose views and opinions in many respects widely differ from our own, we may always appeal as having been written at a very

early  
too  
mon  
Chu  
man  
deat  
whic  
one  
hope  
and  
(  
few  
forei  
ing c  
As  
auth  
from  
as in  
stand  
T  
whic  
Corin  
whos  
the c  
been  
ment  
Com  
Epist  
in th  
the r  
Thou  
and i  
gaine  
had t  
comm  
great  
plan  
ford  
imita  
fully  
ture,  
years  
Corin  
appea  
memo  
vor

early period in the history of the Christian Church ; written, too, by one who had originally, according to his own testimony, been a conscientious and bitter adversary of that Church and a disbeliever in the truths for the sake of which many of its members were willing to suffer imprisonment and death, but who had become by conviction, and by evidence which he could not resist, one of its foremost champions, and one of the chiefest defenders of that faith which he once hoped to destroy, but for which he was now willing to suffer and to die.

Of this Epistle there have been published within the last few years a large number of commentaries, both English and foreign, and of these three are specially named at the heading of this article, all issued during the years 1886 and 1887. As might be expected from the names of the well-known authors of them, they are of great value, while they differ one from the other in some of their characteristic features, as well as in their respective amount of matter, and in the circumstances connected with the writing and publication of them.

The shortest of these commentaries (that by Dr. Kay), which includes the Second as well as the First Epistle to the Corinthians, was issued after the lamented death of its author, whose intense devotion to the study of sacred literature, at the cost, it is to be feared, of his health and strength, had been shown by works published in his lifetime (*e.g.* his Commentary on the Psalms, his contributions to the Speaker's Commentary, in which he edited the Book of Isaiah and the Epistle to the Hebrews, and his notes on the Prophet Ezekiel in the S.P.C.K. Commentary), and by his labours as one of the revisers of the English Version of the New Testament. Though he had occupied prominent positions in England and in India, he was little known by the world, but he had gained the high esteem and affectionate regard of those who had the privilege of enjoying his friendship. This particular commentary, as explained in the preface, is the result of the great interest which he took in the furtherance of an excellent plan adopted by the clergy in the neighbourhood of Chelmsford (as in other places), and worthy in these days of all imitation. It was their custom to meet together, and carefully and critically study in detail some book of Holy Scripture, under the presidency of Dr. Kay, and no less than six years were given to the study of the two Epistles to the Corinthians. On his return from these clerical meetings it appears to have been the custom of Dr. Kay to make memoranda of various points connected with the passage

VOL. XXVI.—NO. LI.

M

which had been the subject of study, and these memoranda form the basis of the commentary which, in accordance with the request of the author before he died, his friend and fellow-collegian, the Rev. J. Slatter, has carefully edited, adding a very full note of his own on chap. xi. 24. The notes are for the most part very short, fresh, pointed, and suggestive. Abounding as they do in simple references to parallel and illustrative passages from Holy Scripture, they require for a full understanding and due appreciation of them real, honest work on the part of a student, which will in the end, we are sure, be far more profitable than the finding everything made plain and easy without any personal effort and trouble.

The second of the three commentaries (Bishop Ellicott's) reminds us of the many similar commentaries on the shorter Epistles of St. Paul, which in bygone years were published in succession by the same author, and which would probably have been far sooner followed by such a one as the present, and by others, dealing with the longer Epistles, had not the writer been called to a bishopric, and in consequence (as has been, to the regret of many, the case with another foremost English commentator) become too fully occupied with various duties pertaining to his office to allow of his continuing, except at intervals, his literary work. In the interesting Preface to his lately-issued Commentary, Bishop Ellicott is careful to explain how much by 'ceaseless interruptions' he has been sore let and hindered in the composition of it, and yet how desirous he had been, following the lines of his former commentaries, to make it as complete as possible for the purpose for which it is specially designed. That purpose he defines as being 'an effort to ascertain, as far as possible, by means of a close and persistent consideration of the grammatical form and logical connexion of the language of the original, what the inspired writer exactly desired to convey to the Church of Corinth, and to all readers of this profoundly interesting Epistle.' Within the limits thus laid down we need scarcely say that the work is worthy of its author, and that it will be most serviceable for those who wish to study the Epistle with critical care. Many references, as in the former volumes, are given to the opinions of ancient and modern commentators (notably in this Epistle as regards the former to the valuable Commentary of St. Chrysostom), and to sermons of famous preachers, and also to some of the leading recent treatises on Christian ethics. In a brief introduction the Bishop gives a terse account of the condition of Corinth at the time when the Epistle was written, of St. Paul's residence in it, as described



in Acts xvii., and its results, and of the circumstances immediately connected with the writing of the Epistle. One of the special features of the former commentaries by the same author is, unhappily, not to be found in the present one: viz. an accurate translation of the Epistle, separated from the text, with notes comparing the renderings of other English translations, *e.g.* Wycliffe's, Tyndale's, Coverdale's, the Geneva Bible, and the Authorized Version. The Bishop gives as the reason for not continuing this custom, his opinion that 'the continuance of his former translations, and the notes that were appended to them, has now been rendered unnecessary by the publication of the Revised Version of the New Testament, to which he refers the student with all possible confidence.' We confess that this does not reconcile us to the loss, especially of the notes, which were often most interesting and profitable to those who desired to have the opportunity of comparing the renderings, and who might now wish to compare in some cases the Revised Version with other older versions.

The third Commentary (Godet's) is in all respects the most complete and exhaustive of the three. The English translation of the work is by the Rev. A. Cusin, of Edinburgh, and forms a part of Messrs. Clark's Foreign Theological Library. The fact that the translation fills two octavo volumes, one of 428, and the other of 492 pages, will be sufficient to show how fully the author has commented upon the Epistle, and there is scarcely any, if any, point of interest connected with it which has escaped his notice. In addition to the Commentary itself, there is an Introduction of thirty-four pages, describing the founding of the Church at Corinth, the external circumstances in which the Epistle was composed, the events which intervened between the founding of the Church and the writing of the letter, and the plan of the Epistle, with an appendix mentioning the most important manuscripts, and the most recent commentaries, foreign and English, upon it. At the end of the Commentary there are four 'conclusions' in regard to (1) the historical result of the Epistle; (2) ecclesiastical offices; (3) criticism of the text; (4) the epistolary work of the Apostle. The Commentary, like other writings of the same author, is 'thorough' in its criticism and interpretation of every verse of the Epistle, and even when we differ from the view taken by him we cannot but admire his evidently conscientious desire to form a right opinion upon the various details which he exhaustively discusses, and his full explanation of his reasons for agreeing with or differing from other

commentators. For anyone who has the will and opportunity for minutely studying the Epistle, with its wonderful multiplicity of interesting subjects, historical, doctrinal, controversial, and practical, the Commentary appears to us to be most valuable and attractive.

As regards the Greek text of these commentaries and textual criticism, the text in Dr. Kay's edition, printed above the notes, is described as being 'mainly that of the old Oxford edition of the New Testament by Mill,' and, as we might expect, there are fewer criticisms on the subject than in the fuller editions of Ellicott and Godet. But occasionally, e.g. on iv. 1, there is a special note in explanation of the reading which is preferred: the reading of the *Textus Receptus* in this instance being preferred by Godet as well as Kay to that which is adopted by Ellicott, by the Revisers, and by most recent editors of the Greek Testament. In another passage (x. 1) he also gives reasons for preferring the reading of the T. R. to the other readings found in certain manuscripts. In this instance, as in the former, Godet agrees with him, while Ellicott prefers τὸν Κύριον τὸν Χριστὸν, in accordance with what he considers to be 'clearly preponderating authority.'

In the commentaries of Ellicott and Godet the consideration of the text forms a very prominent feature. In the former of the two, as in the previous commentaries of the same author, immediately beneath the printed text the reasons for preferring one reading to another or others are concisely stated, and special references are made to the readings adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers of the English Version of the New Testament, and the various degrees of external evidence in favour of any readings are marked by carefully chosen expressions, such as 'preponderating,' 'greatly preponderating,' 'very greatly preponderating,' 'good' authority, and the like. The greatest pains have evidently been taken, as the Bishop justly claims, to enable the reader, not only to understand in each case as far as possible the reasons for the choice which the editor has made, but to see how far and why he agrees with or differs from the leading textual critics of recent times.

In the translation of Godet's Commentary the Greek text is not printed, but in an appendix to the Introduction a short account, as has been already mentioned, is given of the fifteen uncial manuscripts which contain the Epistle in whole or in part, with their dates; and in the body of the work there are frequent and full discussions of the varieties of readings which are set forth in the foot-notes, and reasons are given for the

ac  
he  
tim  
diff  
crit  
inst  
but  
sati  
in i

give  
is th  
with  
of t  
disc  
of th  
sens  
copy

on M  
may  
opin  
cons  
if no  
that  
oppo  
Com  
high  
ing  
years  
him t  
of te  
his C  
guide  
for di

B  
some  
allow  
passa  
opini  
(I  
angels  
Theo  
shortl  
wider

adoption of any reading which the editor prefers, conscious as he is, as he states in his preface, that he has from time to time been 'charged with defective criticism on this point, differing, as he often finds himself obliged to do, from the critical theory and practice of Westcott and Hort.' A notable instance of his thus differing from the latter, and from Ellicott, but agreeing with Kay, who says that he 'is by no means satisfied that the T. R. is not here the better,' is to be found in ix. 10, where he is bold, or rash, to say:—

'All our great modern critics think the preference should be given, as a rule, to the readings of the ancient Alex. MSS. and one is thought to be lagging behind the age if he does not follow them with docility in this path. Now here is a case where the corruption of the text in these documents is patent, and where it is easy to discern the false idea which produced the corruption. The interpreter of the Holy Scriptures is not at liberty to subordinate his common sense to the arbitrariness, the ignorance, or negligence of the ancient copyists.'

It may be feared that this principle of an editor relying on his 'common sense' may sometimes prove a snare, and may lead a critic arbitrarily to prefer his own individual opinion of what the text ought to be to that which a careful consideration of the manuscripts may show it most probably, if not certainly, to have been. We are not, therefore, surprised that Dr. Westcott (whose views on this subject are distinctly opposed to Godet's) in his Introduction to his most valuable Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, while paying a very high tribute to Godet's merits as a commentator and declaring that 'in arranging his thoughts during the last eight years he owes most to Godet, whose Commentary seems to him to be unsurpassed,' is careful to add—'except in questions of textual criticism.' It should be stated that at the end of his Commentary Godet enters fully into the principles which guide him in his preference of readings, and into his reasons for differing from Hort and Westcott on this point.

Before we conclude this article it may be of interest to some of our readers if we compare, as far as our limits will allow, the interpretations of the three commentators of a few passages on which there have always been great varieties of opinion.

(1) Chap. vi. 3, 'Know ye not that we shall judge angels?' Kay, mentioning the opinions of Tertullian, Theodoret, and St. Chrysostom that 'evil angels' are meant, shortly remarks that 'Heb. ii. 5 gives room for suggesting a wider application.' Ellicott, on the other hand, does 'not

hesitate, with all the early expositors, to limit the word here to evil angels, of some of whom at least it is specially said that they are awaiting their judgment—see St. Jude, 6. Godet agrees with the latter, maintaining that 'St. Paul can only be speaking here of higher powers of wickedness.' We cannot but agree with them, and with Canon Evans (whose notes on this Epistle in the Speaker's Commentary are singularly fresh and interesting), differing from Meyer, Alford, and others.

(2) xi. 10: 'For this cause ought the woman to have a sign of authority.' (R. V.) 'on her head, because of the angels.' Here again a question is raised as to whom we are to understand by 'the angels,' and as to the force of St. Paul's argument in connexion with them. Kay's interpretation is, 'She ought to have outward token of her subjection, when in the Church of God, because of the angels who are there (1 Tim. v. 21).' Ellicott's opinion is that 'whenever the words "*the angels*" are simply used, the reference is *always* to the Holy Angels,' and that St. Paul is here referring to them as 'deemed both by the Jewish Church and by the Early Christian Church to be present in the services of the Church.' Godet's view is the same; and the opinions which have been expressed by some ancient as well as modern commentators, that we are to understand 'holy men' or 'rulers of the Church,' or 'messengers' or 'evil angels,' rightly, as we think, find no favour with any of them.

(3) vii. 21: 'Wast thou called, being a bondservant? care not for it, but if thou canst become free, use it rather' (R. V.). Do the words 'use it rather' refer to bondage or to freedom? Does St. Paul advise the slave who has become a Christian to prefer remaining in bondage to accepting freedom if it is offered to him? St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and most modern commentators prefer the former interpretation, and they are followed by Ellicott; Kay, comparing the use of *χρησθαι* in ix. 12, 15 as meaning 'availing oneself of an advantage,' expresses his opinion that, if the object after 'use' were not 'freedom' understood, another object 'would have been used, if only a pronoun.' This is also the view taken by Godet, who refers in support of his opinion to the Epistle of St. Paul to Philemon. Bishop Lightfoot, in a note in his Introduction to that epistle (p. 390, 1st edit.), fully discusses the meaning of this passage, and thinks that 'the balance of opinion seems to be decidedly in favour of the interpretation, "Avail thyself of any opportunity of emancipation."' This is also the opinion of Canon Evans. Fully admitting, as we must do, the

great difficulty of deciding the point, we agree with Kay and Godet, Lightfoot and Evans.

(4) xv. 29: 'Else, what shall they do, which are baptized for the dead?' On this question put by St. Paul, which has given occasion to great discussion and variety of interpretation, Kay holds that the 'latter part may be understood as equivalent to "on behalf (of the hope) of the dead."' It was nearly in this way that St. Chrysostom took it. All who were baptized professed to look for the resurrection of the dead. But still more, the baptized was made a sharer of Christ's Resurrection.' He also says: 'It might well be interpreted in such way as this. If this glorious consummation is not to follow Christ's Resurrection, what are they to look for as their reward, who are baptized so as to fill up the ranks of those who are gone from the midst of us? Why receive baptism to fill their vacant places?' Ellicott adopts the view

'of the great majority of modern interpreters according to which the reference is to dead unbaptized believers, for whose assumed spiritual benefit living believers were baptized as proxies. This custom certainly existed at an early period, and may have been practised in some instances by Corinthian converts. It is to be observed that the Apostle in no way connects himself or his converts with those who were thus baptized, but simply alludes to them as practising what he refers to.'

Godet, after stating that 'about thirty explanations of this passage are reckoned, and that much diversity is due to their ignorance of the usage to which St. Paul refers, and to the absence of any parallel expression to guide us,' says: 'I do not think the Apostle could have taken as the basis of an argument a superstitious custom absolutely opposed to his spiritual conceptions.' He discusses most of the other interpretations, and in conclusion gives his decision in favour of the view that the word 'baptized' refers not to the baptism of water but to the baptism of martyrdom (comparing St. Mark x. 38 and St. Luke xii. 50). 'If there is no resurrection, what will be gained by the baptized ones in their joining the ranks of the dead for the love of Christ?' He also thinks that such an interpretation is in harmony with the words which immediately follow: 'Why do we also stand in jeopardy every hour?' Of these interpretations of a most difficult passage the first of the two seems on the whole to be the most probable, though we confess that it does not altogether satisfy us (see a note by Canon Evans upon the force of the *ὑπὲρ*, rendered 'for' here and elsewhere).

(5) xv. 32: 'If after the manner of men I fought with beasts at Ephesus, what doth it profit me?' Kay agrees with

most commentators in taking the expression used by St. Paul in a metaphorical sense, remarking that 'a Roman citizen could not be thrown *ad leones*,' and comparing a similar expression of St. Ignatius in his Epistle to the Romans, of the meaning of which there can be no doubt. Ellicott inclines to the same view, regarding the reference as being made 'either to some unrecorded incident, or to the state of antagonism with "wild beasts" in the person of human opponents.' Godet, on the contrary, thinks that 'unless we are to ascribe to St. Paul an exaggeration very alien to his character, it will be in every way more natural to apply the expression in the strict sense of the word. If the event happened in a popular assembly the Apostle's protestations might not have been listened to.' We agree with Ellicott and Kay, and also think with many other commentators, that if there had been a literal combat with wild beasts, St. Paul could scarcely have omitted all reference to it in his description of his 'perils' in 2 Cor. xi.

(6) xi. 24: 'This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me.' The first part of this most important passage Kay interprets as meaning 'this is in effect and power.' His editor objects to such limitation as 'wholly inconsistent with the standard of doctrine acknowledged as the rule of the Church,' quoting from St. Ignatius, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus, and stating that the Church of England claims to be in accordance with the mind of the Early Church. His view is that the Church 'announces the fact of a Spiritual Presence, but refrains from all attempt at explaining the mode of that Presence.' Godet regards Jesus as giving the bread to His disciples as 'the symbol of His Body which is about to be given up for them on the Cross, and to become the means of their salvation; the verb "is" being taken in the same sense as that in which we say, as we look on a portrait, It is so and so.' Ellicott, with whom we cannot but agree, in accordance with the view taken by the editor of Dr. Kay's Commentary, considers that *ἐστιν*, 'is,' 'can mean nothing more or less than "is," the particular nature of the identity depending on the circumstances and the context;' and that in this case it is certainly to be understood as 'implying a real sacramental identity, so that the faithful do verily and indeed receive the spiritual food of the broken Body and poured-out Blood of the Lord,' the bread and cup being, in Hooker's words, 'causes instrumental upon the receipt whereof the participation of His Body and Blood ensueth.'

On the latter part of the verse, 'this do in remembrance of me,' Kay's note is very short as regards 'this do,' but it is



supplemented by a long and interesting note by the editor of his Commentary. Dr. Kay remarks that 'when the word *ποιεῖν*, do, seems to have a sacrificial sense, it is only as the crystal appears rose-tinted when a rose is placed beside it, as *eg.* Heb. vii. 27. Here it is as Exodus xii. 28,' and he refers to the commentary of Estius as agreeing with him. His editor, referring to certain passages in the Septuagint Version where *ποιεῖν* has a sacrificial meaning, and also to an article in this Review (No. xlv. p. 329), in which two passages are quoted from Justin Martyr where *ποιεῖν* in connexion with *ἄρτον*, bread, and *ποτήριον*, cup, appears undoubtedly in the sense to 'offer,' questions whether *ποιεῖτε* can be so rendered in this passage, 'as the word *σῶμα*, a body, must be then taken as the object, and such an expression seems strained beyond the capacity of the Greek language.' Ellicott and Godet both take the words as meaning 'Do this continually: *i.e.* thus take bread, give thanks, and break it.' Those who accept the sacrificial use of the word *ποιεῖν*<sup>1</sup> will find that it has already been fully discussed and illustrated in these pages (vol. xxii. pp. 324-330). We may also refer our readers to Mr. Sadler's Commentary on St. Luke xxii. 19, 20, which is thought by some to leave but little to be said or gainsaid on the subject. Even that little, however, should make us cautious not to attach an exaggerated importance to a point on which a difference of opinion is fairly admissible.

On the words 'in remembrance of me,' Kay quotes the Vulgate rendering 'in meam commemorationem,' and refers to the other passages in the Septuagint and New Testament, where the word *ἀνάμνησις* (remembrance) is used, in illustration of the rendering given in Liddell and Scott, 'recollection.' The editor of his Commentary, differing from Dr. Kay, carefully considers the same passages of the Septuagint, and maintains that the word is used in the sense of an appeal to God to remember, or take 'note of the action done in the prayer offered by the people, it not being uncommon in the phraseology of Holy Scripture to speak of God and to address Him as if He needed to be reminded by the worshipper. God has condescended to allow the sacrifice of the death of Christ, the new covenant between Himself and man, to be pleaded in every prayer we offer, but in the sacrament it is pleaded not only by word, but also by most significant action.' Ellicott

<sup>1</sup> We have not anywhere seen it remarked in connexion with this discussion that the verb *πέζω* has the same double meaning of 'do' and 'offer' (Homer, *passim*). Compare 'facio' in Latin. Such analogies are not without some force.

merely remarks that the possessive pronoun *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν (ἀνάμνησιν)* 'is to be taken objectively "in memoriam mei," without any implied emphasis,' while Godet expands the meaning as 'Do this in memory of Me, and of the sacrifice which I am about to make for your salvation. Each time the feast is celebrated the assembly of Jesus presses around His beloved person.' Here again Dr. Kay's editor might quote on his side Mr. Sadler's Commentary on St. Luke, p. 560:

'The word *anamnesis*, except in connexion with the Eucharist in this place and in 1 Cor. xi., is used but once in the New Testament, and that is in Hebrews x. 3: "In these sacrifices there is a remembrance (*anamnesis*) again made of sins once every year." Now the apostolic writer here alludes to a sacrificial act of the Jewish high priest on the great day of atonement, which was the great sacrificial function of the Jewish year, and was to be so exclusively before God that no man was to be in the tabernacle when he performed it (Lev. xvi. 17). In two other places in the Septuagint is the word *anamnesis* used with respect to sacrifices, and in each of these it is expressly mentioned that the *anamnesis* is before God (Lev. xxiv. 7), "the incense may be on the bread for a memorial, even an offering made by fire unto the Lord," and Numbers x. 10. So that when the Lord bid them "Do this for His *anamnesis*," He used a word which indicated a very solemn sacrificial memorial, and not a private act of reminding themselves, or one another.'

But we must refrain from further pursuing these comparisons of interpretation. We fear that we have already far exceeded our limits. Our excuse must be that the subject has seemed to us to be one of peculiar interest, though we are conscious that we have failed to do full justice to it. We cannot refrain from expressing an earnest hope that some who may read this article may be induced to study more carefully than perhaps hitherto they may have done, with the help afforded by one or more of such commentaries as those which we have been reviewing, this most precious Epistle. The more it is so studied, the more, we cannot but think, will the faith of many be confirmed in the historical facts and spiritual consequences of our Lord's life on earth, His death, and His resurrection, and more widely and deeply will thankfulness be felt that there has been preserved for us such a venerable document of early date, admitted by critics of all schools to be a genuine writing of St. Paul, giving such an insight into the belief and system of a leading European Church in apostolic times, and showing how in all fundamental points the belief, and in many essential points the practice, of our own branch of the Holy Catholic Church are in accordance with them.

## ART. IX.—THE ANGEVIN KINGS OF ENGLAND.

*England under the Angevin Kings.* By KATE NORGATE.  
In two volumes. (London, 1887.)

BY no one in our generation have the study and the writing of English history been more deeply influenced than by the late John Richard Green. The book by which his fame was won contained some crude writing, and not a few errors, but it revealed to a world outside the narrow world of scholars what Dr. Stubbs and Mr. Freeman had already made known to the few, and it told its tale with a peculiar and picturesque vividness of narration which few English historians have ever surpassed. The *Short History of the English People* leapt into immediate popularity, and now we may almost consider it an English classic. Green's fame among historical students was increased by *The Making of England*, and it was not lowered by the somewhat risky posthumous publication of his *Conquest of England*. But his influence was not confined to his books, nor has it ended with his life. The writing of English history, especially medieval English history, during the last ten years, has been moulded by his work. His enthusiasm revived the true historical appreciation of the value of archæology and geography, and bore fruit, among other ways, in the foundation of the Oxford Historical Society, which has already issued several valuable publications. His simplicity of style, together with his abundant use of the very words of original authorities, are re-echoed in Mr. York Powell's admirable little *History of England to 1509*. His appeal to the chroniclers has sent the reading public to the writers themselves, and thus caused the publication of Mr. David Nutt's series of *English History from Contemporary Writers*. But the latest and most valuable acknowledgment of Mr. Green's influence is to be found in the two volumes, the result of eleven years' work, 'undertaken at his suggestion, . . . directed by his counsels, aided by his criticisms, encouraged by his sympathy,' which are now dedicated by Miss Kate Norgate to the memory of her 'dear and honoured master.'

Miss Norgate may well be proud of such a master. Mr. Green, if he had lived, would have been proud of such a scholar. Miss Norgate has given us, in two volumes of over 500 pages each, the matured results of deep and conscientious

study. It cannot be said that her writing shows the philosophic insight of the Bishop of Chester, or Mr. Green's own power of vivid and poetic description; but she always writes as a keen observer, a patient inquirer, and a diligent student. Gradually the earlier history of England has been, or is being, rewritten in our time. Leaving to Mr. Boyd Dawkins and Mr. Elton the dawn of our history, Mr. Green took up the tale with the beginning of literary record. Mr. Freeman has made the tenth and eleventh centuries live again for our learning. It was hoped by those who had read the marvellous prefaces to the editions of the great chroniclers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in the Master of the Rolls' series, that the late Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford would give us in his own words the history of the Angevin kings. But circumstances over which students of English history had no control have prevented this, and Miss Norgate has stepped in to fill the place which would best have been occupied (as she would, we are sure, be the first to admit) by the greatest English historian since Gibbon.

As Dr. Stubbs cannot write the history of the house of Anjou, we are glad that Miss Norgate should take up the task, and we heartily congratulate her and the public on the completion of the earlier part of her work. The earlier part only it must needs be, though Miss Norgate gives us no promise of a continuation; for the present two volumes, which end with the year 1206, are manifestly incomplete. They end, it is true, with the loss of Anjou, but they do not end with the end of the Angevin kings of England. John, as king of England, did not cease to be an Angevin because he had lost Anjou, Normandy, Touraine, and Maine. He still summed up in his one person all the worst features of his ancestors' lives. His son, Henry III., too, was a thorough Angevin, but in him the strain of 'demon blood' was becoming exhausted; he had his forefathers' characteristics, but all in a weak and impoverished form. With Edward I. the race of kings became thoroughly English, though even in Edward Mr. Green saw the last flickerings of the Angevin nature.<sup>1</sup> We do not understand why Miss Norgate has said nothing of a continuation of her book, for she has left her subject with startling and almost meaningless abruptness. We all know the common

<sup>1</sup> 'He had inherited the fierce ruthlessness of the Angevins, so that when he punished his punishments were without pity, and a priest who had ventured into his presence with a remonstrance from his order dropped dead from sheer fright at his feet.'—*Short History of the English People*, p. 175.

complaints of the unsatisfactory nature of a chronological division of history by the accessions of kings, but we have yet to discover a dividing line which is not open to greater objections. At any rate, that must be a most unnatural ending which breaks off in the middle of a reign, and leaves the reader presumably ignorant of the fate of the chief persons whose story has been begun. If Miss Norgate had written of the union between England and Anjou, she might well have ended at 1206; but she has written of the Angevin kings, and thus the only fit ending is to be found in 1272. On the other hand, if Miss Norgate ends too soon, she gives us some four hundred pages before she comes to the accession of the first Angevin king of England. She has an extremely interesting and well-written chapter on 'the England of Henry I.,' a very valuable study of the history of Anjou from 843 to 1154, and a detailed account of the reign of Stephen. In these chapters, as throughout the book, Miss Norgate adds considerably to the interest of her work by the thorough examination she has made of the sites of the places most prominent in the history of the times. Now and then, perhaps, we notice a reverence for Mr. Green which borders on superstition. For instance, Miss Norgate has been to Chinon, and watched the waters of the Vienne as they flow, far below the castle rock, in colour as deep a blue as the waters of Lake Lemane. But Mr. Green, in one of his poetic but inaccurate moments, spoke of Henry II. as borne to 'Chinon by the *silvery* waters of the Vienne,' and there passing sullenly away. Miss Norgate has seen for herself, but she dare not, after Mr. Green's opinion, go further than to call the waters '*silvery blue*.'

Miss Norgate gives admirable plans of Winchester, Bristol, Lincoln, Oxford, London, Angers, and Château Gaillard, and the text shows how thoroughly they have been worked out. An instance of extremely good work in this line is to be found in the note to chapter vi., on 'the topography of the battle of Lincoln' (vol. i. pp. 334-336), which is worthy to stand side by side with Mr. Gardiner's thorough examination of the battle-fields of the Civil War. Anyone who knows the ground will appreciate the soundness of Miss Norgate's conclusion.

But Miss Norgate is far from being content with seeing for herself (even if she sometimes uses Mr. Green's coloured spectacles); she has also thought and studied for herself, and she has found no less than three slips in Dr. Stubbs's many

<sup>1</sup> *England under the Angevin Kings*, vol. i. p. 167.

volumes. After all that Mr. Freeman has said of the Bishop of Chester's infallibility, to have discovered three errors (if, indeed, they be errors) should be enough to make the fame of any historian. The first concerns the position of the 'Master Matthew,' who is familiar to readers of the Becket and Foliot correspondence.<sup>1</sup> The second refers to the question as to whether the Count of Anjou was or was not hereditary seneschal of France.<sup>2</sup> The third affects the fair fame of Guy of Lusignan, king of Jerusalem.<sup>3</sup>

Yet Miss Norgate, though she may discover errors in others, is not impeccable herself. She interprets<sup>4</sup> the charter of William the Conqueror to London as confirming to the citizens 'all the law whereof they had been worthy in King Eadward's day,' whereas its reference is to 'ye two' (i.e. the bishop and portreeve). She also falls into utter confusion—as many a writer has done before her—between the Jury of Presentment and the Jury of Recognition, attributing to the former a Norman origin.<sup>5</sup> Indeed Miss Norgate is least successful when treating of institutions; she must needs suffer by the inevitable comparison with the luminous and judicial writing of Dr. Stubbs.

Those who have any affection for the familiar historical names in their old-fashioned form will regret that Miss Norgate has followed in this matter Mr. Freeman and his allies. Many of the uncouth words we may become accustomed to, but surely 'Louis From-beyond-sea' is an unpardonable barbarism. If Miss Norgate will not allow us to call the king by his beautiful name d'Outremer, she at least should be consistent, as is Mr. Freeman, and call him Lewis.

If we are constrained to pick such very little holes as these in Miss Norgate's book, it is because she gives us little opportunity to pick bigger ones. It is a book of which much must be said in very high praise. Every chapter shows a thorough knowledge of the contemporary authorities, and the results

<sup>1</sup> See *England under the Angevin Kings*, vol. i. p. 376, note 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 59, note 1. Cf. Stubbs, *Constitutional History* (2nd edition), vol. i. p. 448, note 3. Miss Norgate here mainly follows M. Luchaire, *Histoire des Institutions Monarchiques de la France sous les premiers Capétiens*.

<sup>3</sup> *England under the Angevin Kings*, vol. i. p. 59, note 1.

<sup>4</sup> Vol. i. p. 45. Cf. Stubbs, *Select Charters* (third edition, pp. 82-83). The translation is there given correctly in all editions save the first. Miss Norgate seems to have fallen into her mistake through following Mr. Loftie, *London*, p. 25.

<sup>5</sup> Vol. ii. p. 122. But on the next page Miss Norgate rightly asserts that the Jury of Presentment 'may be traced back to the ordinance of Ethelred II.' The question is undoubtedly a difficult one.



of that knowledge are always expressed with sound judgment, and in an easy and readable style. Where all is well done, it is difficult to select portions for special praise, but we may instance Miss Norgate's description of England under Henry I.,<sup>1</sup> and from 1170 to 1206, with her chapters on the Church under Stephen and on the 'last years of Archbishop Theobald,' as worthy of particular attention. The history of Hungary is the familiar difficulty of the historical student, and we think that second to that grim mystery, until Miss Norgate wrote, stood the early history of Anjou. Here Mr. Green, in a few brilliant pages, had sketched the lines for his pupil to work upon; but it is no reproach to him to assert that Miss Norgate has bettered her instruction. It is scarce too much to say that English historical scholarship of recent years has produced no more sound and valuable work than the chapters on the beginnings of Anjou, Anjou and Blois, and Anjou and Normandy, in Miss Norgate's first volume.

It is well that we should have this thorough examination of the history of the foreign states that have influenced our history. Within a century of the death of the last king of the house of Cerdic, England was governed by rulers from three different Gaulish houses. The three Norman kings had all the solid, masculine strength of their race. Stephen of Blois was of another mould, but in him racial characteristics were as strong. Miss Norgate well says:

'His good qualities were plainly visible; time and experience alone could reveal the radical defect which vitiated them all. That defect was simply the old curse of his race—lack of steadfastness; and it ruined Stephen as it had ruined Odo. It was ingrained in every fibre of his nature; it acted like an incurable moral disease, mingling its subtle poison with his every thought and act, and turning his very virtues into weaknesses; it reduced his whole kingly career into a mere string of political inconsistencies and blunders; and it wrecked him at last, as it had wrecked his great-grandfather, on the rock of the Angevin thoroughness' (vol. i. p. 281).

Henry II. had all the cleverness of his kindred, and all the 'Angevin thoroughness.' Yet his rule differed from that of his predecessors on the English throne, not only because the peculiar genius of his race—as unlike as could be to that of Normandy or Blois—was plainly seen in all he

<sup>1</sup> Of this, since this review was written, Mr. Freeman (*English Historical Review*, Oct. 1887, p. 777) has said that it makes him regret that Miss Norgate's detailed narrative does not begin where his own leaves off. He could give no higher praise.

did, but also because he had, what the other foreign kings of England had not, some definite principles of government to apply to all the lands of his great 'Empire.' It had been possible for William the Conqueror to be two different men in England and in Normandy: Henry Fitz-Empress was the same in England and in Aquitaine, in Normandy and Anjou, Maine, Ireland, Touraine, and Brittany. He did not treat England on one plan, and Anjou or Aquitaine on another: so far as circumstances would allow, his policy, and even the application of it in detail, was the same for all. For instance, though it was his aim to destroy for ever feudalism as a principle of government, he waged no perpetual war against what, for want of a better name, we may still call the feudal system. His objects are to be discerned from no harsh and arbitrary deeds, still less from any sudden severity; it is the cumulative effect of little acts which reveals an undeviating purpose. We see the one aim, extending over all his lands, in his unvarying practice of securing and retaining in his own hands, wherever it was possible, not the lands or the persons, but the castles of the great barons. The first measures of his reign included the enforced restoration of the royal castles,<sup>1</sup> and the destruction of those which had been erected without licence.<sup>2</sup>

The same policy was followed for thirty-five years. In 1156, when Henry had reduced his brother Geoffrey to submission, he left him his lands, but deprived him of his castles.<sup>3</sup> When Richard of Striguil had sailed to Ireland, Henry professed great anger against the princes of South Wales for letting him depart, and forgave them only when they consented to place their castles in his hands.<sup>4</sup> In Ireland, whenever he could, he had the castles put under his own servants.<sup>5</sup> On the death of Hugh de Lacy, Henry at once sent his son John to seize his castles.<sup>6</sup>

In the suppression of the rebellion of 1173 the king was singularly clement. He put no baron to death; he restored

<sup>1</sup> William of Newburgh (*Chronicles of Stephen*, &c., Rolls Series, i. 101-105).

<sup>2</sup> Miss Norgate (i. 401) gives the number of them as 1115, the statement of Matthew Paris. She does not mention that the *contemporary* Robert de Monte says there were only 375.

<sup>3</sup> Mirabeau, Chinon, and Loudun. Wm. Newburgh, as above, i. 114.

<sup>4</sup> Giraldus Cambrensis, Rolls Series, v. 274.

<sup>5</sup> *E.g.* Reimund surrendered all the castles to Fitz-Aldelm, the king's seneschal, in 1176 (*Gir. Camb.* v. 335), and royal officers were placed in the castles on the appointment of Hugh de Lacy as 'justiciar in Ireland,' 1177 (*Gir. Camb.* v. 347-8); Benedict of Peterborough, i. 163-164.

<sup>6</sup> Bened. Petr. i. 350.

to many their lands, while he retained their castles.<sup>1</sup> He made the king of Scotland, by the peace of Falaise, yield the castles of Roxburgh, Berwick, Edinburgh, Stirling, and Jedburgh.<sup>2</sup>

Two years later he removed the castellans of his barons and placed his own men over their castles, both in England and Normandy—not excepting even his faithful servant Richard de Lucy.<sup>3</sup> From this time 'the visitation of the castellanships was made a regular article of the commission of the judges, and the governors were frequently changed, so as to get the posts gradually and entirely in the hands of the king's officers'.<sup>4</sup> In the same year Henry ordered FitzAldelm to seize the castles of Richard of Striguil, who had recently died.<sup>5</sup> It is tedious to multiply instances, but the policy, which seems to have originated in a prerogative of the dukes of Normandy, extended over all the king's realms.<sup>6</sup> In the region of constitutional reform this unity of action is equally apparent. The Assize of Arms had its parallel in Anjou.<sup>7</sup> How the constitutional measures of Henry II. in England and in Normandy hung together has never been more clearly expressed than by Miss Norgate:

'A comparison of dates, indeed, would almost suggest that Henry, when contemplating a great legal or administrative experiment in England, usually tried it first in Normandy, in order to test its working there upon a small scale before he ventured on applying it to his island realm. An edict, issued at Falaise in the Christmastide of 1159 to 1160, ordaining "That no dean should accuse any man without the evidence of neighbours who bore a good character, and that in the treatment of all causes the magistrates of the several districts at their monthly courts should determine nothing without the witness of the neighbours, should do an injustice to no man and inflict nothing to the prejudice of any, should maintain the peace, and should punish all robbers summarily," seems to contain a foreshadowing at once of some of the Constitutions of Clarendon which created such excitement in England four years afterwards, and of the assize which followed two years later still. A commission of inquiry into the administration of the Norman episcopal sees and viscounties in 1162 was a sort of forerunner of the great inquest into the conduct of the English sheriffs in 1170. This, again, was followed next year, as we have seen, by an inquiry into the state of the ducal forests and

<sup>1</sup> *Dialogus de Scaccario*. Note the cases of the Earls of Leicester and Chester as narrated by Benedict of Peterborough, i. 73 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> Bened. Petr. i. 97.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* i. 160.

<sup>4</sup> Stubbs, Pref. to Bened. Petr. ii. li.

<sup>5</sup> Bened. Petr. i. 161.

<sup>6</sup> *E.g.* Bened. Petr. i. 195 (Châteauroux); i. 292 (Poitou); i. 294 (all dominions); i. 304 (Brittany).

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* i. 270.

demesnes, which has its English parallels in the great forest assize of 1176, and in an inquest into the condition of the royal demesnes ordered in the spring of 1177. On the other hand, a roll of the Norman tenants-in-chivalry, compiled in 1172, seems to have been modelled upon the English "Black Book" of 1168; and when Henry determined to institute a thorough reform into the whole Norman administration, it was at the English exchequer table that he found his instrument for the work' (vol. ii. pp. 192-3).

In his ecclesiastical policy, again, Henry had one aim for all his possessions. He had no idea of a national Church any more than Becket had. He would have done in Normandy and Anjou as he did in England, if the circumstances had been alike. The privileges or rights round which the battle was waged were not of purely English growth. Becket's conduct would have been the same if he had been Archbishop of Rouen; the whole tone of his correspondence is cosmopolitan, if the subject of it is a struggle in England. There was one Catholic Church in all Henry's dominions; the king would unite the different branches more closely together. The Church of Ireland was obliged to conform in everything to the uses of the English Church.<sup>1</sup> It was a principal article of the Treaty of Falaise that the Scottish Church should admit its subjection to the English,<sup>2</sup> and Henry judged between William the Lion and his bishops as he did between his own bishops and barons.<sup>3</sup> The Welsh Church was kept in subordination to the English by the assertion of the supremacy of Canterbury,<sup>4</sup> by the refusal of the oft-repeated demand of Giraldus for a Welsh metropolitanate, and by the appointment of Englishmen and Normans to Welsh sees.

Again, though we learn from Roger of Hoveden that, at a time when all over France heretics were being burned, Henry would not allow such punishment 'in terrâ suâ,'<sup>5</sup> yet he was determined to suppress heresy by the civil arm in all his dominions. The unhappy Publicani, who were excommunicated by the Ecclesiastical Council of Oxford in 1166, were condemned by the Assize of Clarendon to be cast out in the bleak winter, no man being suffered to shelter or feed them on pain of death—'a fate,' as Mr. Froude says, 'more piteous than the stake.' In England they had made but one convert—'illa muliercula' she was to William of Newburgh—who recanted at the first sign of persecution; but in Toulouse a

<sup>1</sup> Gir. Cam. v. 283.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* i. 265-6, 276-7.

<sup>3</sup> As in the case of Bangor; see *Materials for the Hist. of Archbishop Becket*, v. 225-239.

<sup>4</sup> Rolls Series ed. ii. 273.

<sup>5</sup> Bened. Petr. i. 96.

similar heresy was almost triumphant, and here Henry, as overlord, was as ready to interfere.<sup>1</sup> The clergy, too, were passed from post to post through all the king's dominions. Walter of Coutances was first Bishop of Lincoln, then Archbishop of Rouen. Richard of Ilchester was Archdeacon of Poitiers. John Cumin, one of the king's English clerks, was made Archbishop of Dublin. John, the Kentishman, was Bishop of Poitiers, Ralph of Sarr became Dean of Rheims, and Roger of Pont l'Evêque Archbishop of York. The *Catalogus eruditorum B. Thomæ* would furnish other names. It was even proposed to transfer St. Thomas himself to a foreign see. Indeed, were there not another side, we might be tempted to infer from these instances, in matters civil and ecclesiastical, that Henry designed to weld his 'bundle of estates' (the phrase is Miss Norgate's) into one compact and permanent empire.

We have mentioned some of the king's doings in matters ecclesiastical; and this leads us to observe that, in her absence from all bias and in her conscientious exactness, Miss Norgate seems to possess two of the most important qualifications for an ecclesiastical historian. The Church history of the period she has studied is of extreme interest and importance, and much of it she has necessarily left untouched. We feel sure that, if she should feel inclined to take it up in a separate volume, the work would be cordially welcomed. The history of the English Church under the 'early Plantagenets' is in some sort a mirror of its whole life. It is a succession of reformations, a series of revivals. New objects are constantly aimed at, not always successfully; new ventures are undertaken, not always wisely. Much of the old has constantly to be cast aside, though the central unity remains. Much that is base stands side by side with the purest motives, and often frustrates the highest endeavours. Yet through all there is ever visible, if sometimes indefinite, the striving after a lofty ideal, a city in the heavens brought down to earth, a Jerusalem, not only above but here also among men and the mother of them all.

The growth of the English Church under the Angevin kings centres round the figures of four great men—Henry of Winchester, Thomas Becket, Stephen Langton, and Robert Grosseteste; while second only to the importance of those prominent lives are the primacies of Archbishops Theobald, Baldwin, and Hubert Walter. All these men, though in different ways, were connected with movements of reform. Miss

<sup>1</sup> Bened. Petr. i. 196-8, 220.

Norgate has done nothing better than her account of Henry of Winchester, whom it has been too much the fashion of historians to represent as a sort of typical 'proud prelate.'

'Steeped in ecclesiastical and monastic traditions from his very cradle, Henry was before all things a churchman and a monk. It was to him, and to men like him, that the religious revival which sprang up in his uncle's later years naturally looked for the guidance which it could not find either in the secular bishops or in the shy, irresolute primate; and the consequences appeared as soon as the king was dead, when the helm of the State and that of the Church—the one dropped by Roger of Salisbury, the other never firmly grasped by William of Canterbury—were both at once taken by the young Bishop of Winchester. His personal influence sufficed to ensure his brother's election to the throne; the legatine commission sent to him in 1139, overriding the claims of the new primate, made him the acknowledged leader of the English Church, and, coinciding as it did with the complete breakdown of all secular government at Bishop Roger's fall, practically vested in him, and in the clerical synods which he convened, the sole remnant of deliberation and legislative authority throughout the kingdom; clergy and people followed him like a flock of sheep; yet he was never really trusted by either of the two political parties, because he never really belonged to either. His own political ideal was independent of all party considerations. It was the ideal of the ecclesiastical statesman in the strictest sense: to ensure the well-being of the State by securing the rights and privileges, and enforcing the discipline, of the Church. In his eyes the whole machinery of secular government, including the sovereign, existed solely for that one end, and he carried out his theory to its logical result in the synods which deposed Stephen and Matilda each in turn, as each in turn broke the compact with the Church which had raised them to the throne. Of the use to be made in later days of the precedent thus created, he and his brother clergy never dreamed; they are, however, entitled to the credit of having been the only branch of the body politic which made an organized effort to rescue England from the chaos into which she had fallen. The failure of their efforts hitherto was due partly to the overwhelming force of circumstances, partly to the character of Henry himself. His temper was like that of the uncle whose name he bore, the calm, imperturbable Norman temper which neither interest nor passion could throw off its balance or off its guard; and with the Norman coolness he had also the Norman tenacity, fearlessness, and strength of will. But although the main elements of his nature were thus derived from his mother's ancestors, he had not altogether escaped the doom of his father's house. He was free from the worst defect of his race, their fatal unsteadiness of purpose; but he had his full share of their rashness, their self-will, and their peculiar mental shortsightedness. His policy really had a definite and a noble end; but his endeavours to compass that end were little more than a series of bold experiments. Moreover, his conception of the end itself was



out of harmony with the requirements of the time. Churchman as he was to the core, his churchmanship was almost as unlike that of the rising generation, trained up under the influence of the new religious orders, as the downright worldliness of the Salisbury school with which some of them were, though most unjustly, half-inclined to confound him. He belonged to a type of ecclesiastical statesmen, or rather political churchmen, who did not shrink from arraying the Church militant in the spoils of earthly triumph, and would fain elevate her above the world in outward pomp and majesty, no less than in inward purity and holiness. This was the school of which Cluny had been, ever since the days of Gregory VII., the citadel and stronghold; and Henry was thus attached to it by all the associations of his youth as well as by his own natural disposition. But in the second quarter of the twelfth century this Cluniac school was losing its hold upon the finer and loftier spirits of the time, and the influence of Cluny was beginning to pale before the purer radiance diffused from St. Bernard's "bright valley," Clairvaux' (vol. i. pp. 348-9).

While Henry of Winchester was striving to uphold before the distracted kingdom the highest ideal of ecclesiastical statesmanship, a practical reformation was being begun all over the land by the foundation of monasteries. Austin canons, Cistercian monks, religious soldiers of the Temple and the Hospital, Premonstratensians, Gilbertines, built between 1135 and 1154, amid all the miseries of those 'nineteen winters,' no less than one hundred and fifteen religious houses. The great Yorkshire abbeys are the monuments of those noble men who recolonized the lands that had lain waste for over sixty years. In the later years of Stephen, while this great monastic work was restoring life to the Church in the rural districts, an intellectual revival was being nurtured in the house of Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury. Theobald's personality is one which does not itself strike us at first as we study the history of the time; it is through his influence on others, not through any great acts of his own, that his name deserves remembrance. Roger of Pont l'Évêque, John of Salisbury, and Thomas Becket were among the many whom he trained to be the leaders of the spiritual and intellectual reformation which he designed. There was sad need; John of Salisbury was bidden to relieve his righteous soul by telling the world of the griefs that lay at his heart. In *Polycraticus de nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum*, while he exposed the abuses in the Church, he reflected the plans and hopes of the Archbishop's court. Secularity was eating away the life of the Church; the employment of ecclesiastics as ministers of the crown had had its result in the appointment to ecclesiastical preferment of men utterly unfitted for such

charge; if not openly, yet in reality, money was the power that ruled everywhere. And already discipline was becoming impossible, owing to the purchase by monasteries of exemption from all but Roman jurisdiction. The complaints which John of Salisbury uttered in 1158 were echoed by Nigellus, more than thirty years afterwards, in a much more bitter vein. Though Theobald laid the foundation for a reformation of the higher clergy, and though at his death there were many learned and devoted bishops, the greater part of the work was left for his successors. In 1163 not only the new Archbishop of Canterbury but also the king himself had a scheme of reformation, and it is to the incompatibility of the two designs that the struggles of the next seven years must be attributed. Henry's scheme was Erastian, Becket's was conservative. Henry wished to give outward order to the Church by the strong hand of the State. Becket wished to elevate the tone of the whole Church by a more strict enforcement of ecclesiastical censures, and by the example of pure and self-sacrificing lives in high places. Henry desired to reform the Church from without, Becket from within.

Born of Norman parents, yet brought up as a Londoner, Becket was, in his strength of purpose and abhorrence of compromise, a thorough Englishman. When he first became the king's chancellor he had to recommend him, besides the favour of the archbishop and his own quick talents, the learning he had acquired at Paris, Bologna, and Auxerre, and the practical experience he had learned under Osbern Huitdeniers. It may have been he who brought Vacarius to lecture at Oxford, as Miss Norgate suggests;<sup>1</sup> though his own studies were always more in the canon than the civil law. He certainly was for some years Archbishop Theobald's right-hand man, and he soon became as indispensable to the king as to the archbishop. As chancellor his brilliant invention of scutage was a piece of sound constitutional work, and could in no just sense be considered an infringement of ecclesiastical privilege.<sup>2</sup> From the moment of his consecration Becket had a new work to perform. It now became possible for him to put into practice the idea by which he had long been animated, and to prove that he was not unworthy of the care with which Theobald had trained

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 379. Mr. Maxwell Lyte, however, says that Vacarius was brought over by Archbishop Theobald (*History of the University of Oxford*, pp. 10-12).

<sup>2</sup> On this point M. du Boys, *L'Église et l'État en Angleterre*, pp. 177-179, has some very sensible remarks.

him. It is said that from the first he warned the king of the result. A similar tale is told of Hildebrand.<sup>1</sup> In both cases it was not long before the quarrel broke out. In 1163 the separation was first seen in the opposition which the new archbishop made, on a purely secular question of taxation, but the real cause of division between king and archbishop was not long in coming to the front—their divergent schemes of Church reform. It is a wholly unfair view which does not admit that Becket was as anxious as Henry to purify the Church. It is plain also that that was no selfish claim for personal exemption which was wide enough to cover the widow and the orphan, and to reserve for ecclesiastical punishment not only the criminous clerk but also the layman whose crime was committed against an ecclesiastic. And, further than this, as we look back, and observe the lines upon which constitutional progress has travelled, we may recognize the cause for which St. Thomas of Canterbury shed his blood as embodying not only the blind, inarticulate horror of humanity at the barbarous punishments of a bloodthirsty age, but also as the assertion of personal freedom and of the mutual responsibility of classes, as against the iron system of centralization that marked the epoch of the Angevin kings. St. Thomas was first an exile and then a martyr for his unyielding determination to enforce the Church discipline, and his refusal to accept that of the State. 'La discipline aussi bien que la foi de l'Eglise a dû avoir des martyrs,' says Bossuet in his *Panegyrique de St. Thomas de Cantorbéry*. It was the feeling that he, who had, during his short sojourn as archbishop in England, done so much to revive the best traditions of the office and work of the episcopate, was contending not so much for ecclesiastical liberties as for the only true and wholesome method of Church reform, that made his dwelling at Pontigny and at Sens like the court of a distressed monarch; for Becket at Pontigny was as real a danger to the system then powerful in England as ever were Charles II. at Cologne or Bruges, or James II. at St. Germain's. The catalogue of the *eruditi S. Thomæ* (i.e. of those who accompanied him in his exile) contains the names of the men then most eminent for learning and holiness; the list of his correspondents includes nearly every notable churchman in Europe.

Though there are exceptions (such as William of Newburgh, who would not presume to judge between the com-

<sup>1</sup> Bonitho, *Liber ad amicum* (Jaffé, *Monumenta Gregoriana*, p. 657).

batants, since they seemed to him both to be moved by righteous desires), yet no doubt the true conscience of the age pronounced that Becket was in the right, and that he died a martyr. If popular admiration means anything at all, we must attach value to it in the case of St. Thomas, for no reverence was ever more real, no popularity ever more enduring, than his. But still, though Henry's submission after the murder was to a certain extent a gain for individual liberty, Becket's life, as regards the great aim of ecclesiastical reformation, was almost a failure. This was simply due to the lack of power to put his aims into execution, for certainly no man was ever more prodigal of censures than he. Henry still held all promotion in his hands, and there was no authority anywhere to check the monastic exemptions. The satire of Walter de Mapes and the invective of Giraldus Cambrensis, at the end of Henry's reign, are just as bitter as the complaints of John of Salisbury thirty years before. Thus, when Archbishop Baldwin sat in the chair of St. Augustine, after the death of the insignificant Richard of Dover, the question was just as acute, the need of reform just as urgent.

Baldwin, and Hubert Walter after him, devoted themselves to one definite aim—the reduction of the monastic houses to obedience, and the assertion of episcopal and primatial authority. This was, in a greater or less degree, the conscious aim also of Geoffrey of York, of Hugh of Coventry, and of Savaric of Wells. Bishops and archbishops alike failed completely; and when we leave the Angevin dynasty in 1206, the reformation is still far to seek. It was to come in different ways from Stephen Langton, from the Friars, and from Robert Grosseteste.

- A
1. A
2. A
3. SA
4. T
5. A
6. R
7. F
8. T

It is  
to gi  
denc  
The  
all ra  
disting  
peop  
varyi  
We  
auth  
exile  
of H  
'a p  
Orig  
'a m  
stitut  
Chris  
crow  
genc  
brok  
chara  
woul  
As F

## ART. X.—THE CONVERSION OF THE JEWS.

1. *A History of the Jews.* By H. H. MILMAN. Second edition. (London, 1830.)
2. *A History of the Jews.* By M. MARGOLIOUTH. (London, 1853.)
3. *Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History.* By JAMES PICCIOTTO. (London, 1875.)
4. *The Jews in Ancient, Modern, and Mediæval Times.* By JAMES K. HOSMER. (London, 1886.)
5. *A History of the Jews.* By REV. H. C. ADAMS. (London, 1887.)
6. *Reports of the London Society for the Promotion of Christianity among the Jews.* (London, 1882-3-4-5-6.)
7. *Facts and Details of the East London Mission to the Jews.* With a Preface by the LORD BISHOP OF TRURO, and an Introduction by Rev. S. J. STONE. (London, 1884.)
8. *The Report of the Parochial Missions to the Jews.* (London, 1884.)

It is said that when Frederick the Great told his chaplain to give him, and to give him in the fewest words, the evidences of religion, the chaplain answered, 'Sir, the Jews.' The Jews are the immortal race. They have mingled with all races. They have amalgamated with none. They have a distinct and defined ancestry, such as belongs to no other people. The English people are Celt, Dane, Norman, Teutonic, varying elements which we can only partially discriminate. We trace the pedigree of the Jews from the dawning of authentic history, and all through the Christian ages the exiled Israelite has preserved his individuality. In the words of Holy Writ, they have been 'a special people,' 'witnesses,' 'a people dwelling alone, not reckoned among the nations.' Origen pointed to their existence, in his own early age, as 'a most convincing miracle.' Rightly considered, they constitute in themselves a standing evidence of the truth of Christianity. Neither the rage of crowds nor the policy of crowns, neither fire nor sword, neither persecution nor indulgence, neither alliances, nor intermarriage, nor social life have broken down the invisible barriers, obliterated the distinctive character. Those who are intolerant of the doctrine of miracles would do well to examine the living miracle before them. As Bishop Lightfoot says :—

'You may question, if you will, every single prophecy in the Old Testament, but the whole history of the Jews is one continuous prophecy more distinct and articulate than all. You may deny, if you will, every successive miracle which is recorded therein; but again the history of the Jews is from first to last one stupendous miracle, more wonderful and convincing than all.'

The long history of the Jews is wonderfully set forth in the sure word of prophecy: 'For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim' (Hosea iii. 4). On the one hand, there is no monarch, or national government, or priestly sacrifice; but, on the other hand, the Jew, purged from his old sin of idolatry, has been a witness of the measure of inspired truth vouchsafed to his fathers. Various efforts have been made to look at the facts of modern Jewish history apart from their connexion with revealed truth. It is in this way that they have been treated by the author of *Daniel Deronda*, and in Lessing's *Nathan the Wise*. The Jews have been taught by some that in these days of universal brotherhood they should give up their exclusiveness and isolation. It has been urged by the rationalist that their unique position is simply due to their exaggerated clanship, their unity of interest, and their intense traditionalism. The enigma of their history can alone be solved by the devout student of Holy Writ, who looks at their present condition in the light of their past history, and by that Word obtains some insight into their future. In every direction the Jews have attained to the highest eminence. In the Congress of Berlin the two most eminent statesmen, Bismarck and Beaconsfield, were both of Hebrew extraction. In finance they have proved themselves the kings of the world. The greatest events in modern history have been directed as much by the loans of the Jews, as by the policy of statesmen and the genius of commanders. Some of our greatest musicians, the great tone-poets, such as Meyerbeer, Rossini, and Mendelssohn, were Jews. Their civilization in Spain preserved arts and literature in Europe in the darkest hours of the Middle Ages. In learning and science they have victoriously held their own. Disraeli says of the Jews who are professors in German universities—'their name is Legion.'<sup>1</sup> Spinoza, who has so modified modern thought, was a Jew, and so was Heinrich Heine, the poet alike of Germany and of France. Neander, the most single-hearted of ecclesiastical historians, was a Jew. Soult and Massena were Jews; the

<sup>1</sup> *Coningsby*, p. 195.



name of the most valiant of Napoleon's Marshals, Massena, in fact, being an anagram of Manasseh.

'After a thousand struggles,' writes the author of *Coningsby*, 'after acts of heroic courage that Rome has never equalled; deeds of divine patriotism that Athens, and Sparta, and Carthage have never excelled; we have endured fifteen hundred years of supernatural slavery, during which, every device that can degrade or destroy man has been the destiny that we have destroyed and baffled. The Hebrew child has entered adolescence only to learn that he was the Pariah of that ungrateful Europe that owes to him the best part of its laws, a fine portion of its literature, all its religion' (p. 197).

It is greatly to be regretted that there is no adequate history of the Jews in existence. For most readers the third volume of Dean Milman's *History of the Jews* is the clearest and most popular account, but it is brief, and requires both revision and additions. A considerable amount of Jewish literature was brought together at the Anglo-Jewish Exhibition in the Albert Hall, in the season of last year (1887). The Jews regret that they have not a history worthy of the name, and ascribe as the reason that their documents and authorities perished in their wars and sufferings. Isaac Disraeli, the father of Lord Beaconsfield, might have written such a work, but he quarrelled with his synagogue, and in his children his family glided into the profession of Christianity. It is only when Christianity is adopted that the strong Hebrew character receives any sensible modification. Picciotto's work is an interesting assemblage of facts, but it is lacking both in literary power and lucid arrangement. We are not aware of any Christian historian, except Milman, who has ever professed to grasp the subject as a whole. The late Dr. Margoliouth, who wrote copiously on Jewish subjects, has quite failed in this respect. Professor Hosmer, in the 'Story of the Nations' series, treats the subject pleasantly, but superficially. The Rev. H. C. Adams has recently published a *History of the Jews* marked by considerable learning and ingenuity, which endeavours to give a synchronistic history of the Jews in different countries during the Christian era. Mr. Adams points out the striking fact that from age to age the number of the Jew population has never greatly varied. Our knowledge must be gathered from the notices, mostly scattered and incomplete, which are to be found in the ecclesiastical and secular historians, and from the rolls and archives which in modern days have been so wonderfully opened up to historical investigations. In all such history there is a sad monotony of misery from the time of the

Diaspora to the frightful persecutions in Russia, the latest wave of the anti-Semitic feeling. It was the great work of Sir Moses Montefiore that he endeavoured to relieve the sufferings of his compatriots in every part of the world. Beyond all other history, Jewish history is the record of lamentation, mourning, and woe. The narratives of the expulsions which have been so frequently witnessed in Europe are the most tragic that belong to history. Beyond the confines of Europe, in Arabia, where the Jews for the first and only time in their history since the destruction of Jerusalem had constructed a kind of state, the war between the followers of the False Prophet and the Hebrews was one of extermination. The Jews in this conflict, as in the massacres of Alexandria, showed how capable they were of a bloody retaliation. The worst of all was when the Inquisition, through its general-in-chief, Thomas Torquemada, ordered 'that in four months every Jew, native or sojourner, should quit the realms of Aragon, Castile, and Granada, never more to return, under penalty of death and confiscation of goods.' One million of Jews were found to abjure their religion. Half a million, robbed of their property, which by forced sales were practically confiscations, were forced to embark, not knowing to what land they should journey. They were starved, thrown into the sea, sold into slavery, assassinated by murderers to obtain possession of their personal effects.

Whatever may have been the persecutions endured both from States and Churches which had not learned the true principles of Christianity, it is gratifying to know that from the Church itself proceeded whatever there was of toleration and justice for the Jews. Doubtless there was immense persecution in Councils and Episcopates, but this vein of mercy is found in the Church and nowhere else. It was the miserable privilege of the Jews that the internal slave-trade of Europe had fallen almost entirely into their hands. The Europeans often forbade the Jews having a Christian slave, but the slavery often prevented massacre and murders. The fourth Council of Toledo (A.D. 633) seems to recognize Jewish slave-dealing, and twenty years later another Council complained that even the clergy, in defiance of the law, sold captives to the Jews. This same Council laid down the doctrine that men ought not to be persecuted to compel them to believe. Gregory I. (the Great) addressed himself seriously to the matter. He bewailed the cruel and impious traffic. The trade was interdicted, but the Jew was to be recompensed for the manumission of his Christian slaves. 'In all other respects,' says Dean Milman, 'this wise and virtuous pontiff religiously main-

taine  
deno  
along  
'God  
was n  
L  
histo  
stater  
tory  
Engl  
state  
writte  
the r  
of E  
Vene  
earlie  
cerpt  
extra  
fully  
and  
they  
them  
able  
piled  
centu  
by W  
ferred  
Chris  
prese  
that a  
with  
M  
work  
in E  
Jewis  
learn  
prove  
took  
to est  
towns  
the co  
hold  
care t  
were  
minst

tained toleration towards the Jews.' Similarly St. Bernard denounced the persecution against the Jews when it raged along the shores of the Rhine in the time of the Crusades. 'God,' he said, 'had punished the Jews by their dispersion ; it was not for man to punish them by murder.'

Let us endeavour at this point to trace something of the history of the Jews in England. Many of Dean Milman's statements in his *History of the Jews* are repeated in the *History of Latin Christianity*. The chapter on 'The Jews in England' is extremely slight, and, indeed, in our present state of knowledge, requires to be rewritten. It is hardly written with the great Dean's usual accuracy. He speaks of the mention of the Jews in the Ecclesiastical Constitutions of Egbert, Archbishop of York. Egbert, the pupil of the Venerable Bede, and the master of Alcuin, was one of the earliest and best of our ecclesiastical writers, but the *Excerptiones* can hardly be described as his, as they contain extracts from the Capitularies of Charlemagne. The point is fully discussed in a learned and exhaustive note in Hadden and Stubbs's edition of *The Councils* (iii. 415), who say, 'as they stand, they are *not* his.' There is nothing original in them, and certainly not sufficient evidence to make it probable that they are even based upon anything which he compiled. In the charter granted to Croyland Abbey,<sup>1</sup> nearly a century later, it is curious that there is a confirmation granted by Wiglaf, King of the Mercians, of land and property conferred on the Monastery 'by his predecessors, or by other Christian faithful, or by Jews.' It is remarkable that even at the present time, Jews will occasionally support Christian societies that aim at the conversion of people other than themselves, and with the tacit understanding that *they* are to be let alone.

Mr. Green, in his *Short History*, and also in his amplified work, gives a very good account of the settlement of the Jews in England in the time of William the Conqueror. The Jewish traders followed him from Normandy, and he had learned what an unfailing source of revenue they might prove if he allowed none to plunder them but himself. He took them under his special protection, and allowed them to establish their own quarters or 'Jewries' in all the chief towns. The Jew was a mere living chattel, as Aristotle defined the condition of the slave ; he had no civic rights, and could hold no portion in the land. But a royal justiciary took care that he had his rights ; his bonds, for the sake of safety, were deposited in a chamber of the royal palace of Westminster, which, from their Hebrew name of 'Starres,' gained

<sup>1</sup> See Kemble's *Cod. Diplom.* vol. i. No. ccxxxiii.

the title of the Star Chamber. The Jews were allowed to erect their own synagogues and direct their own ecclesiastical affairs through their chief Rabbis. Mr. Green proceeds to say :

'No measures could have been more beneficial to the kingdom at large. The Jew was the only capitalist in Europe, and heavy as was the usury he exacted, his loans gave an impulse to industry such as England had never felt before. The century which followed the Conquest witnessed an outburst of architectural energy which covered the land with castles and cathedrals ; but castle and cathedral alike owed their existence to the loans of the Jew. His own example gave a new direction to domestic architecture. The buildings which, as at Lincoln and St. Almondsbury, still retain their title of "Jews' Houses," were almost the first houses of stone which superseded the mere hovels of the English burghers. Nor was the influence of the Jews simply industrial. Through their connection with the Jewish schools in Spain and the East they opened a way for the revival of physical science. A Jewish medical school seems to have existed at Oxford ; Adelard of Bath brought back a knowledge of mathematics from Cordova ; Roger Bacon himself studied under the English Rabbis. But to the king the Jew was simply an engine of finance. The wealth which his industry accumulated was wrung from him whenever the king had need, and torture and imprisonment were resorted to if milder entreaties failed. It was the wealth of the Jew that filled the royal exchequer at the outbreak of war or of revolt. It was in the Hebrew coffers that the Norman kings found strength to hold their baronage at bay' (p. 83).

It is remarkable, however, that Mr. E. A. Freeman differs from his devoted scholar, the late Mr. Green. Mr. Freeman remarks in his *Norman Conquest* (vol. v. App. Q. p. 818) that there is no distinct mention of the Jews before the time of William Rufus, with the important exception of the so-called Laws of Edward, which rather represent the state of things under William than under Edward. These prove that the Jews were resident in England before the Conquest. 'It is certain,' says Mr. Freeman, 'that the Norman Conquest gave a great impulse to their coming.' According to William of Malmesbury (iv. 317), the Red King convoked a meeting at London of Christian bishops and Jewish rabbis for the purpose of discussing the tenets of their several creeds. The evil-hearted king swore, by the face of St. Luke—his favourite oath—that if the Jews got the better of the dispute he would embrace Judaism. At another time, says Eadmer (*Hist. Nov.* p. 47), he declared that he would bring back to Judaism a young Hebrew convert to Christianity, on condition that he received sixty marks of silver. The youth refused to abjure, but the king nevertheless kept half the money. 'Strange to say,' writes Mr. Freeman, 'the king, who surpassed all his fellows

to erect  
al affairs  
ay :

kingdom  
heavy as  
stry such  
lowed the  
h covered  
edra like  
example  
ngs which,  
of "Jews"  
rseded the  
nce of the  
he Jewish  
revival of  
existed at  
athematics  
e English  
of finance.  
from him  
ment were  
of the Jew  
revolt. It  
strength to

an differs  
Freeman  
(818) that  
ne time of  
so-called  
of things  
e that the  
st. 'It is  
quest gave  
William of  
meeting at  
he purpose  
The evil-  
s favourite  
e he would  
(*Hist. Nov.*  
Judaism a  
on that he  
t to abjure,  
Strange to  
his fellows

in vice and blasphemy, was never cut off from the communion of the Church' (*N. C. v. 72*). The wonderful fact remains that there has always been a remnant that has been true to truth. In every age there have been those who, at any possible sacrifice and despite every discouragement, have accepted the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth. Christendom has always given a cold reception to the converted Jew. When Jews have professed themselves Christians they were threatened with the most dreadful punishments unless they renounced their Christianity. Whenever throughout Europe a Jew was converted it was customary forthwith to confiscate his property. A Jew at Canterbury became converted, and appropriately took the name of Augustin. As an act of great mercy, when all his other property was confiscated he was allowed to retain his house. Belager, a learned Oxford Jew, earnestly petitioned the king on his conversion that he might be allowed to retain that moiety of his possessions in which there were some valuable books, and his request was granted. To make some amends for the system of spoliation a charitable house was founded in London for converted Jews, the 'Domus Conversorum.' They had always had a claim on the revenues of the conventual establishments. One of the rolls of Henry III. gives a list of five hundred Jewish converts. The Prior of Bermondsey built a hospital for Jewish converts, and the Dominicans built a similar house in the Jewry at Oxford. The Dominicans were the order who especially took up the work of attempting to convert the Jews. At their instance King Edward I. sent a warrant to the sheriffs to compel the Jews to listen to the preaching of his friars. The foundation of the convent continued till the famous banishment of the Jews in 1290, when its revenues were practically confiscated to Gentile purposes. The house itself became the residence of the Master of the Rolls. When the Jews reappear the conversions reappear. It is evident that the line of conversion was continuous. In the first year of Queen Anne, an Act of Parliament provided that Jewish children, being converted to Christianity, could compel their parents to provide them with a maintenance. Some attempts have been made to put this law in force, but it has practically become obsolete.

The connexion of the Jews with Oxford is interesting. The Jewry was a town within a town, with its own language, its own religion and laws, its peculiar commerce, its peculiar dress. No city bailiff could penetrate into the square of little alleys which lay behind the present Town Hall. With regard to the houses in this Jewry Mr. Green remarks (*History of the English People*, i. p. 215):—

'It is a proof of the superiority of the Hebrew dwellings to the Christian houses about them that each of the later town-halls of the borough had, before their expulsion, been the houses of Jews. Nearly all the larger dwelling-houses, in fact, which were subsequently converted into academic halls, bore traces of the same origin in names, such as Moysey's Hall, Lombard's Hall, or Jacob's Hall.'

Mr. H. C. Maxwell Lyte, in his most interesting *History of the University of Oxford*, goes much more fully than Mr. Green into this story of the Oxford Jews. He tells us that the Dominicans settled down in the very heart of the Israelitish colony, where they opened a humble oratory and school. So many Jews were baptized that a 'Domus Conversorum' like that in London was opened on the site of the present Town-Hall, and the king contributed thirty oaks towards building the school. Bishop Grosseteste forbade the Jews taking more than forty-three per cent. from the students. The townspeople impartially hated both Jews and students. Mr. Lyte endorses the story from Tovey's *Anglia Judaica* of some Jews making an attack on a cross borne in procession by the clergy on their way to the cemetery of St. Frideswyde, and being commanded by the king to provide two new crosses in its stead, one of marble, and one of silver for processional uses. After some altercation this was accordingly done.

The best description of the state of the Jews is found in Sir Walter Scott's great historical story of *Ivanhoe*. Sir Walter has not spoken of the Jews in his introduction and notes, but he has manifestly studied and assimilated his authorities, and his picture of the friars is as accurate as it is vivid. This is fully recognized by Dean Milman in one of the suggestive notes of the *Latin Christianity*. The song of the Hebrew maiden Rebecca, the daughter of Isaac of York, has a positive value in the history of the Jewish trouble in promoting interest and sympathy with the race :—

'When Israel of the Lord beloved  
Out of the land of bondage came,  
Her father's God before her moved,  
An awful guide in smoke and flame.  
By day along the astonished lands  
The cloudy pillar glided slow ;  
By night Arabia's crimson'd sands  
Returned the fiery column's glow.

Then rose the choral hymn of praise,  
And trump and timbrel answered keen,  
And Zion's daughters poured their lays,  
With priest's and warrior's voice between.



No portents now our foes amaze,  
 Forsaken Israel wanders lone ;  
 Our fathers would not know Thy ways,  
 And Thou hast left them to their own.'

After every vicissitude of favour and disfavour, of protection and persecution, the Jews were finally expelled this country, under every circumstance of atrocity, by a monarch from whom we might have expected better things, Edward I. (A.D. 1290). Henceforth, except in sporadic instances, they disappear from English history for more than two centuries and a half. It is the old story again repeated of their expulsion from Spain, from Germany, from France. But nothing is more remarkable than the intense vitality of this wonderful people. Decimated, insulted, crushed, robbed, outraged, they always eventually return to the lands from which they have been driven out. The bush is always in flames, and yet it is never consumed. They pass through every variety of indulgence and severity. Again and again we expect that they have been entirely stamped out of a country, and then they emerge once more. After expulsion and persecution they become as numerous and affluent as ever.

A good deal of obscurity rests upon the subject of the return of the Jews in the time of Oliver Cromwell. It is quite certain that the Jews of Amsterdam had conferences and correspondence with him on the subject of the return. The illustrious Manasseh Ben Israel, who wrote a history of the Jews in England since the time of their expulsion, had various interviews with Cromwell before the Privy Council and various London merchants. There was a war of pamphlets, one of them against the Jews being written by Prynne the 'Histriomastix.' The upshot is not very clear. Evelyn writes in his Diary (December 14, 1665), 'Now were the Jews admitted ;' and Bishop Burnet writes, 'He [Oliver Cromwell] brought a company of them [Jews] over to England, and gave them leave to build a synagogue.' There is, however, no evidence to show that Oliver Cromwell ever permitted them to come by any formal act ; nevertheless they seem to have been tacitly permitted. It was not, however, till the Restoration that they came in any numbers. The real restorer of the Jews to this country was not Oliver Cromwell, but Charles II. In 1660 we find an injunction by the Lords in Council to the House of Commons to take measures for the protection of the Jews. In 1662 we find the earliest authentic record of a Jewish synagogue in King's Street, Aldgate, the founders being the Sephardin, or Spanish and Portuguese Jews.

It should be said that, although Cromwell was sufficiently statesmanlike to admit the Jews, the great Puritan body set themselves steadfastly against them. In the Reformation movement there was no sign of help or sympathy for the Jew. 'Know, dear Christian,' wrote Luther, 'and doubt it not, that next to the Devil himself thou hast no more bitter, poisonous, violent enemy than a Jew who is set upon being a Jew.' If we look to the other extreme, we find unbelievers manifesting the greatest illiberalism towards them. Voltaire, who was himself a money-lender, and naturally hated those who interfered with his business, calls them 'an ignorant and barbarous people who for a long time have joined the foulest creed to the most frightful superstition and unconquerable hate towards those who endure and enrich them.' To Gibbon they are an obstinate and sullen company. And even Mr. Buckle, with all his philosophical calm, can only call them that 'ignorant and obstinate race.'

For the years after Charles II. the Jews have been so happy as to possess little distinctive history. An earnest desire for their conversion has never been entirely absent from the Christian mind. Bishop Kidder should be honourably mentioned for his contribution to the Jewish controversy. In a Christian land there is always a conscious or unconscious process of evangelization going forwards, and certain it is that many of the best Jewish families have been gradually absorbed into the Christianity around them. To these belong the names of Eardley, Bernal, Ricardo, Mocatta, Lopes, Goschen, Disraeli. Various schemes for conversion, upon the history of which we cannot now enter, were from time to time formulated. The Jews, for their part, seem to have quite given up their ancient zeal for proselytizing, unless, indeed, we ought to exempt the Jews of Amsterdam. One remarkable proselyte was made in England, in that unhappy man, Lord George Gordon, of the 'No Popery' riots, whom we may charitably suppose to have been insane. He was admitted a Jew, with the usual Jewish rites, and acquired some knowledge of Jewish ceremonies and Rabbinicals. During his long imprisonment in Newgate, where he died, he celebrated service every Saturday with a number of Polish Jews.

It is much to be regretted that the Church of England has never taken any official action for the promotion of missions among Jews and Gentiles. The Church of Rome and the Presbyterian Churches have been wiser in their generation in their Boards of Missions and the College de Pro-

paganda Fide. In England we have almost entirely left these things to 'voluntary contributions' and to individual efforts. Once, and once only, at the Brighton Church Congress of 1874, has the subject been brought with any fulness before the notice of Churchmen. Some curious and unsatisfactory consequences have followed from this condition of things. In 1808 was founded the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews. Like other societies founded about the same time, notably the Bible Society and the Religious Tract Society, the Society was made up both of Churchmen and Dissenters. To its earliest years belongs only a melancholy history. The fusion did not work well. There were very scanty results, and the society was deeply involved. Then Lewis Way, who is really the founder of the present Society, stepped forward, and paid some 20,000*l.* to clear off its embarrassments, on condition that it should be henceforth a Church Society, pure and simple. Lewis Way is often mentioned in the religious history of his time. He had a remarkable personal history. He was a barrister of small fortune, Dr. Wolff tells us, and one day as he was walking in a street in London, he met by chance with an old gentleman with whom he entered into a conversation, whose name also was Lewis Way, and who invited the barrister Lewis Way to dinner. They became friends, and soon afterwards the old man died, and left to the barrister 380,000*l.*, with the condition that he should employ it for the glory of God. He took orders in the Church of England, and his desire was to devote his whole life to the conversion of the Jewish nation and the promotion of their spiritual and temporal welfare. He was the founder of the English Church in the Avenue Marbœuf, Paris, which is now a thing of the past. He took sixteen Jews into his house, and baptized them all; but one of them stole his silver spoons, and another was transported for forging his name. Lewis Way once went on a missionary tour to Russia, and read to the Emperor Alexander the 44th chapter of Isaiah, with the intent to induce him to become another Cyrus for the restoration of the Jews to the Holy Land. It is to Mr. Way's unfortunate experiences that Macaulay alludes in one of his earlier poems, though Sir Charles Trevelyan, his biographer, has not cleared up the allusion:

'Each, says the proverb, has his taste; 'tis true;  
 Marsh loves a controversy; Coates a play;  
 Bennet a felon; Lewis Way a Jew;  
 The Jew the silver spoons of Lewis Way.'

The resuscitated Society has had a long and varied history. It has never been altogether able to throw off the tone and taste of its primitive connexion with the Dissenters. A good deal of its former financial weakness has also been cleaving to it. Yet its continued existence for so many years, and the immense amount of support that it has been able to conciliate, testify to the depth and extent of the sympathy in England for the cause of the Jew. A great deal of unfavourable criticism has been passed on its Reports. It has been said that the statements of the Reports have not been borne out by actual facts. For instance, it has been said that a wrong idea has been given of the attendance at Christ Church, Jerusalem. That attendance was largely made up of the missionaries, their families and servants, and the tourists who come in increasing numbers, yet the impression was conveyed that the large total was made up of converts. On the contrary, it is alleged that there have been periods of years during which not a single convert has been made out of the adult population of Jerusalem. The Society has received considerably more than a million pounds, and it is not easy to see 'where all the money has gone.' Of course, however, we know very well that spiritual results cannot possibly be gauged by pecuniary standards. The Society has had some illustrious missionaries, such men as Joseph Wolff and Joseph Barclay, Henry Stern and Michael Rosenthal. It is obvious that a really great missionary, equipped with special powers and special preparation for his work, full of hope and zeal and Christian daring, cannot be at the beck and call of a committee at home, obscure men, of no knowledge or experience to signify, and with only a vague and undefined personal responsibility. Such committees generally break up into sub-committees, and sub-committees themselves have a tendency to fall under the domination of individuals, generally the well-paid secretaries of the Society.

In the recent biography of the Rev. Henry Stern, a valuable book well worth perusing, his biographer, Mr. Isaacs, says: 'One so noble and disinterested should have been exempt from the jealousy of the weak and from the arrogance of official incompetence. It was not till nearly the close of his career that he was placed on the Committee of his Society and received an appointment at Palestine Place.' With regard to the operations of the Jews' Society, Bishop Barclay put the case in a mild, guarded way to one of their agents: 'During the last ten years matters have been much changed, and more spiritual life is wanted in the Protestant community.'

The course of our subject has led us to make some strictures on the London Jewish Society, but we own with pleasure that the reports of recent years, which appear at the head of our article, possess a more favourable character, although it will not be till the lapse of some years that readers will be able to appreciate and verify the statements. The Society certainly possesses a remarkable organization, and has numbered many pious and able labourers on its muster-roll. The Rev. S. J. Stone, the author of 'The Church's One Foundation,' and many other noble Christian lyrics—who has himself laboured much for the Jews on definite Church lines—thus writes, with characteristic moderation :

'For a long time after my ministry began I was unable to feel hopeful or satisfied that, in any direction that I was aware of, the Church was doing her work effectively for the gathering in of the Jews. The Low Church party had, for a long time, much to their honour, largely supported a Society of their own, and I so greatly respect their earnestness in the matter that I cannot find it in my heart to say more than this, that their work among the Jews only needed, so far as I may venture to judge, to have been characterized by more definite Catholic teaching, by the putting forth of the truth as it is in Jesus, on clearer Church lines, to have been much more effective.'

We are glad to say that of recent years there have been some distinct attempts that have attained an encouraging degree of success to promote the conversion of the Jews on definite Church lines. It is found that our Church system has an especial attraction for the Jew. It enforces upon him the fact that there is a priesthood of unbroken succession from Messiah Himself, and that there is an altar of which they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle. It is found, too, that the great argument of the Messiahship of Jesus is best of all presented by a Hebrew to Hebrews ; and, indeed, it has been questioned whether there is a single instance of a Jew being converted by any other agency than that of one himself a convert from Judaism. There was a Jewish Rabbi, the son of a Jewish Rabbi, who, about a dozen years ago, inaugurated a mission to the Jews of the East End which has done, and is doing, a great work. Mr. Michael Rosenthal had, in former days, travelled in Europe, Asia, and Africa on behalf of the Jews of Jerusalem, collecting alms for the poor of his nation, and obtaining a high reputation for zeal, ability, and probity. It pleased God in the slow influences of time to enable him to see the truth of the great aphorism of St. Augustine : 'Novum Testamentum in Vetere

latet; Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet.' He embraced Christian truth and was baptized by Dr. Ewald, and has done much work among his countrymen in bringing the saving truths of Christianity to their knowledge. He attached himself to what was then the only Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews. He did good work for his Society in Damascus, in Smyrna, and also in Mesopotamia. In the synagogue of Orfa, Ur of the Chaldees, when he had pointed out to the Jews the notes, the signs of the Messiah, and showed how they combined in Jesus of Nazareth and in Him only, they threw every possible missile at him, inflicting a wound, and would have done far worse had it not been for the interposition of a Bedouin servant. He, like other agents of the Society, did not consider that he was worthily treated by it, and looked out for some other avenue of usefulness. The occasion came. Mr. Rosenthal enjoyed the friendship of the Rev. G. H. Wilkinson, then the Vicar of St. Peter's, Eaton Square, now Bishop of Truro.

'I have known Mr. Rosenthal,' writes the Bishop in one of the pamphlets before us, 'in a close and unbroken friendship for more than twelve years, and have been intimately acquainted with all the details of his mission, and can testify to the blessing which God has vouchsafed to his labours. He is a remarkable man of great culture and refinement and power in influencing his fellow-countrymen. We are very anxious that as many parishes as possible should take an interest in his work.'

Mr. Rosenthal's mission work in the East of London among the Jews was thus started by Bishop Wilkinson, the lamented Lord Justice Thesiger, and generally by the congregation of St. Peter's, Eaton Square. According to the idea of parochial missions to the Jews, he became curate to the Rev. E. J. Stone, of St. Paul's, Haggerston, and has mainly worked in Mr. Stone's parish, and the parish of St. Augustine's, Stepney. It is a highly interesting fact that the latter parish, with a population of 8,000, contains no less than 3,000 Jews. The facts relating to this mission appear in the publications on our lists, and in the annual Reports published in the *Magazine* of St. Peter's, Eaton Square. We will venture to say that these will prove extremely interesting reading. The present writer has attended the mission-house, the classes, and the Hebrew services, and has carefully verified the facts of which some short account shall be given.

We venture to say that, not in Jerusalem itself, with the large staff under the London Society, and its expenditure of some 5,000*l.* a year, have such results been obtained as



in this East London Mission. Nearly 150 adults, besides many children, have been baptized at St. Paul's Church, Haggerston. We have repeatedly attended baptisms where more than ten adults have been baptized at the same time. There is something very thorough and satisfactory about these baptisms. Nowhere in any English parish can the system be more careful or even rigorous. So far from there being any haste to procure favourable returns, a large proportion of the catechumens instructed are remanded for a year. Every baptized adult proceeds to confirmation as soon as possible, and then receives the communion of the Lord's Supper. We are afraid that, if adult baptism leads to nothing further, this is not sufficient and satisfactory. This is precisely one of the weak points of the London Jewish Society. We meet with many instances of baptism, and we would form most favourable hopes therefrom. But we infrequently read of confirmation, and the reception, after Holy Baptism, of Holy Communion. There is not any absolute stress laid on this necessity of the spiritual life. Herein lies the thoroughness of the work of the East London Mission. 'I can thankfully testify,' writes Mr. Stone in 1885, 'that no one, either in sympathizing sorrow or in a sceptical spirit, can point to any one of the converts baptized by Mr. Rosenthal in my church as lapsed or unworthy.' He testifies that those who remain within reach 'are regular and frequent communicants, and show by the quiet earnestness of their demeanour, and their steady use of religious opportunities, how real is the work which has been done in them.' Many of those who have left the parish have become centres of light and usefulness in other parishes, and have carried the truths which they have learned in the East End of London to the remotest parts of Europe. The good lesson spreads beyond local limits. Various adult Jews are baptized in various churches as ordinary candidates, and many Jewish children are brought by their parents to church for baptism.

The local habitation of the Mission first consisted of a few rooms in a dwelling. Then an entire house was secured. So great has been the number of inquirers that we have observed as many people outside in the street as could find admission in the house. To obviate any necessity for exclusion, the Boys' National Schoolroom is now used on Saturdays, the Hebrew Sabbath, for religious instruction. Nothing is more interesting than to see these Hebrews, perhaps 200 in number at a time, hearing and asking questions, and, as at the Synagogue at Berea, searching the Scriptures to see if those things are so. At the church of St. Augustine's, Stepney, every Lent

and Advent, there are services with the Anglican Liturgy, and hymns in the Hebrew language. There is also a periodical celebration of the Lord's Supper in Hebrew. The translation of our offices was, we believe, either made by Bishop Alexander or under his supervision. We have to remember that in the usages of the synagogue we find the remote origin of various practices and forms of worship perpetuated from the Jewish Church. Our Prayer-Book, in its earlier pages, presents many examples of our obligations to Jewish liturgies. We may add that the reverence and devoutness of the Hebrew Christians impressed us as being in strong contrast to a great deal of frivolity and irreverence which we, some time ago, observed with pain in the great synagogue, modelled after the Temple, of the Portuguese Jews at Amsterdam.

We have examined the last Report and balance-sheet of the East London Mission. Some of the items of expenditure are extremely interesting. When a Jew becomes a Christian, he falls at once into a deplorable condition. He is cursed and thrown off by his family and friends. He is excluded from his trade. He becomes a pariah and an outcast among his people. There is reason to believe that there is a considerable number who accept but who dare not profess Christianity from fear of the Jews. To the convert, under such circumstances, it becomes necessary to offer brotherly sympathy and aid. It would be a plain contradiction to the mind of Christ not to help him to bear some of his burdens. It has been found necessary to enable fifteen converts to emigrate to America and the colonies; fourteen have been settled in business in this country; three students are entirely trained, and two partially—one at St. Augustine's College, Canterbury—in preparing for ordination and mission-work; and 164 inquiring Jews and Jewesses have been sheltered and maintained for a longer or shorter time. The limited amount of temporary help received bears no proportion to the great and almost intolerable sacrifices made by the Jews who accept Christianity. The bulk of these men are poor men, for the poor of this world are chiefly those that are rich in faith. But the missionaries can also point to men of wealth, ability, social standing, and education among the recruits to the army of the faithful.

The number of Jews in England is estimated as being about 60,000. It is constantly being augmented by the emigration of poor Jews from abroad, especially from Russia. Despite the great poverty of the Jews, a Jew is very rarely found in a workhouse. It is estimated that his trade earnings are twice those of an ordinary artizan. They help one

another, and keep many businesses entirely in their own hands. This is the reason of the immense loss and poverty that happens to the Jews that have surrendered the faith of their forefathers, or rather have found its full development and completeness in the religion of Jesus Christ. They fall into social disgrace; they lose their friends and relations; their earnings drop from pounds to shillings; absolute starvation stares them in the face. So great is this necessity of preaching the Gospel to the Jews, and giving them help and sympathy during their ingathering to the fold.

Another Society which calls for distinct mention is the Parochial Mission to the Jews. This is now affiliated to the Additional Curates' Society. Earnest-minded clergymen, who found that a large number of their parishioners consisted of Hebrews, recognized that it was their clear duty to bring the lost sheep of the house of Israel to the knowledge of the true Messiah. There are supposed now to be some 50,000 Jews in London, worshipping in some eighteen different synagogues, and there are forty other towns in the kingdom with one or more synagogues in each, including large centres of population such as Birmingham, Bristol, Leeds, Manchester, Liverpool, Hull, and the university towns of Oxford, Cambridge, and Durham. The design of the Societies is to help incumbents in the evangelization of their Jewish parishioners by providing them with curates specially trained for the purpose, and to carry out this purpose in a twofold way—(a) by the special training of men who, after ordination, shall be willing to devote their time to this particular object, or (b) providing stipends for licensed curates specially qualified for the work. The secretaries are Sir James Philipps, Canon Sutton,<sup>1</sup> and the Rev. J. G. Deed, and a large amount of episcopal support has been secured. The Society has faithfully adhered to its programme, and has done good work, sadly neglected by the Jews' Society, in training candidates into a special fitness for dealing with Jews. The Report gives an account of twelve different gentlemen connected with the labours of the Society. The Committee think that they are very far from having accomplished even the tenth part of their work. At least the London parishes ought to be provided with missionary curates among the Jews, and there ought to be a missionary curate in every large town where there is a synagogue.

<sup>1</sup> Since these pages were in type, the Rev. F. H. Sutton has been taken to his rest. *'Multis ille bonis flebilis occidit.'*

'It is to be hoped,' says the Report, 'that by the blessing of God and the active sympathy of the members of His Holy Church, the fund may gradually become more adequate to the full accomplishment of this great and noble work. It is in this trust and confidence that your Committee again approach the Christian people of England, with the prayer that they will help them, and strengthen their hands in their endeavour to carry out the great object of the fund, which is the "fetching home to the flock of Christ" those members of the ancient people of God who are our brethren and our fellow-citizens.'

We must observe, however, that the efforts of the East London Mission and the Parochial Jewish Mission are after all local. They belong strictly to the sphere of home missions. There seems to be no effort at present in the ranks of the High Church party to reach the Jews who are scattered abroad. The London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews is the only organization for grappling with the subject all over the world, and they hardly do more than touch the fringe of the subject. At the present time there is a greater willingness on the part of the Jews to listen to the truth than has ever been the case in their antecedent history. The combined testimony of all the missionary agencies clearly brings this out. The clearing away of the sad but picturesque Juden-gasse at Frankfurt and of the Ghetto at Rome, with which most travellers were familiar, and the pulling down some years ago of the rookery of houses which once formed the London Jewry, are outward signs of a great change that is passing. The earlier baptisms at St. Paul's, Haggerston, once threatened serious disturbances, and it was repeatedly found necessary to call in the assistance of the police. This, too, has almost entirely passed away. It would seem that the Jews, of their own accord, largely resort to missionaries, and largely purchase copies of the Old and New Testament. The publication of the Revised Version of the Old Testament has been received with the greatest interest by them. In the South of Russia there has grown up a Reformed Jewish Church, having points of similarity to the Old Catholic movement, that is working its way to an enlightened Christian system. The Jews in the South of Russia, and also the Jews in Spain, assert that they were separated from their countrymen in the time of our Lord, and deny all complicity in His crucifixion. In every part of Europe there seems to be an instinct of migration among the Jews towards the Holy Land. Bishop Blythe, the recently appointed bishop in Jerusalem, writes to say that, whereas the Jewish population of Palestine some time back was 15,000, it is now 45,000. In the apparent general willingness

to investigate the truth there is probably some rebate to be made from our calculations, owing to the indifference and rationalism that so widely pervade our times, and we are afraid are nowhere more dominant than among the modern Jews. 'The morning cometh and also the night.' The powers of belief and unbelief, here as elsewhere, are sharply contrasted and defined.

It is supposed that the number of believing Jews in Great Britain is about 5,000. There are many who, convinced in their hearts, fail to make a public profession of their faith. There are many who, while convinced of the Messiahship of Jesus, do not acknowledge His divinity and are practically Arians. In Germany there are at least 7,000 Christian Jews. In that country much greater interest is taken in the Jewish question than among ourselves, and there are many more societies and institutions connected with it. In a large degree in this country we have been obliged to borrow both our music and our missionaries from Germany. The cause is now beginning to work its way to the front in America and Australia. We may venture to hope for an increasing improvement in the men and methods of the London Jewish Society, more tolerance and liberality, more distinct Church teaching. The Church Missionary Society has its missions in Palestine. Why should not the S. P. G. extend its operations so as to include some efforts to deal with the Jews in foreign parts? And is it too much to hope that some day there will be a distinct Church Society dealing with the Jews both at home and abroad?

For the religious mind, there can be no doubt of the necessity and blessedness of seeking to bring home the lost sheep of the House of Israel to the one fold and the one Shepherd. It is time that an era of love should supersede the era of persecution. There are many passages of the prophetic Scriptures which belong to the Catholic Church, and cannot be limited to the Jewish Church. On the other hand, there are many passages which apply directly to the Jewish Church. The Rev. S. J. Stone writes in the *Monthly Packet* :—

'About the time that I was looking forward to holy orders, and was at home during a long vacation, I heard a sermon preached by a friend of my father's, at his request, on the text "The gifts and calling of God are without repentance" (Rom. xi. 29), which made a profound impression on me, deepened by a subsequent close study of that (I think) often neglected chapter. In it I saw that St. Paul makes especially five statements. Firstly, that though for their idolatry some of the Jews, in the times of the kings, were cast off, yet not all; there

was a remnant. Secondly, that though the Jews, after the First Advent, were, as a race, cast off, yet through their fall the Gentiles were taken into the covenant of salvation. Thirdly, that though the Jews, as a body, are now cast off, yet they shall at last be gathered in again, for they are not cast off in God's final purpose, for "The gifts and calling of God are without repentance;" "God is not a man that He should lie, or the son of man that he should repent" of his promises. Again, that as from their falling aside ensued the riches of the world, so and by much more shall the world be enriched by their complete recovery. Again, that the Gentiles are to, and ought to, have a part in the work of this recovery.'

It was the saying of Joseph Mede to his students at Christ College, Cambridge, day by day, '*Quid dubitas?*' The condition of the Jews, judging by his correspondence, was a frequent subject of question and dubitation. He had the ingenious idea that, as St. Paul was miraculously converted, so should the Jews be suddenly converted by a sign from Heaven, perhaps only visible to themselves, and that as St. Paul was the great teacher of the Gentiles, so the converted Jews should become the great converting power of the world. We know not: but of this we are sure, that we should all echo the words of the Apostle, 'My heart's desire and prayer for Israel is, that they might be saved.' We believe that all preaching should still 'begin from Jerusalem,' and that the ancient promise has not lost its power, 'Blessed is he that blest thee.'

---



## ART. XI.—PESSIMISM AND SCIENTIFIC MELIORISM.

1. *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung.* Von ARTHUR SCHOPENHAUER. Sechste Auflage. (Leipzig, 1887.)
2. *Das sittliche Bewusstsein.* Eine Entwicklung seiner mannichfaltigen Gestalten in ihrem innern Zusammenhange, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf brennende sociale und kirchliche Fragen der Gegenwart. Von EDUARD VON HARTMANN. Zweite durchgesehene Auflage. (Berlin, 1886.)
3. *Zur Geschichte und Begründung des Pessimismus.* Von EDUARD VON HARTMANN. (Berlin, 1880.)
4. *Der moderne Pessimismus.* Von Dr. EDMUND PFLEIDERER. (Berlin, 1875.)
5. *Scientific Meliorism and the Evolution of Happiness.* By JANE HUME CLAPPERTON. (London, 1885.)

THE centenary of Schopenhauer's birthday on the 22nd of February last, and the erection of a lasting monument to his name and fame, invite us to consider the alarming growth of modern Pessimism. For Schopenhauer may be called its father.

Is this the worst of worlds imaginable? is fast becoming the question of the day, as its opposite, Is this the best of worlds? was asked and answered in the affirmative by Leibnitz in the last century. The prevalence of pessimistic views of life is one of the symptoms of what has been called the malady of the nineteenth century. That malady is scepticism. The rationalistic movement of the last century produced a false optimism, and the scepticism of this century has been followed by pessimism. It is but natural that men who have lost faith should grow sad and desponding, dissatisfied with the present and distrustful of the future. That this is a marked feature of modern thought is evident enough. We are thus led to ask, What is the nature of this new creed, or rather this old creed under a new form, and how are we to account for its ready acceptance in an age of progress and among the most progressive nations of Europe, whose tendency should be, as until lately it used to be, optimistic to the last degree?

Before we answer this question it is important to mention *in limine* that modern pessimists find fault with their own name. Malism, they affirm, would more properly indicate their position, for it is too much to say that this world is the

worst of worlds ; all we can say is that it is a very bad one, the limits of our knowledge preventing us pronouncing an opinion on the comparative goodness of other worlds. It was the error of Leibnitz, to say that this is the best of all possible worlds. Modern pessimists<sup>1</sup> sitting at the feet of scientific positivists prefer to reserve judgment on this point. For the same reason George Eliot refused to be called an optimist, because it savoured of presumption to make one's subjective ideal world the arbitrary standard of all worlds known and unknown. But she acknowledged herself to be a meliorist, discarding the use of superlatives where comparison is so difficult, and without predicting absolute results from present effects, only professing to do what lay in her power to bring about relative improvement, and so leaving the world comparatively better than she found it. Hence the use of the term 'Scientific Meliorism.' Thus malism (or, as we shall continue to call it, pessimism) and meliorism put into juxtaposition represent two concurrent tendencies of the day, a theory of the universe to all intents and purposes pessimistic, and a practice founded on this theory to render a state of things in which evil predominates over good more tolerable if possible, so as to turn the balance in relieving the necessities and remedying the ills of life as far as this can be done by human agency ; and, moreover, to do so in accordance with the laws of nature ascertained by science, irrespective of any speculation as to a future state of existence.

To follow the course of these two tendencies—hopeless pessimism and hopeful meliorism—as the double aspect of the same phase of contemporary thought is the main object of this paper, with a view to show what amount of truth there is on both sides of the shield, and how far the errors in either case find their correction in the Christian view of life and social development. With this object we proceed to sketch the leading principles of modern Pessimism in outline, without attempting anything like a complete exposition of its doctrines, which, indeed, would demand no less than a treatise, and would be far beyond the scope and intention of the present paper.

The system of Schopenhauer may be briefly stated as follows. The primal principle of Existence in the external world and the mind of man is Will, and although the world only exists as a representation in the human mind, the mind

<sup>1</sup> See E. von Hartmann's *Philosophie des Unbewussten* (9th edition), ii. pp. 282-84.

itself is secondary to Will, and only does its bidding, except in the highest acts of intellectual and æsthetic contemplation, when it is fixed on the eternal types of things, and in entire self-forgetfulness becomes the subject of pure thought, the 'will-less, painless, timeless subject of knowledge.' Not only genius in its loftiest flights, but every aspiring mind absorbed in the contemplation of ideas is freed for the time being from the thralldom of egoistic volition, 'the wheel of Ixion stands still, freed from the prison-house of blind desire, he enjoys the Sabbath of æsthetic beatitude.' If this momentary emancipation could be rendered permanent, happiness might be attained, but it would be the bliss of Nirvana, the extinction of desire, and with it the complete cessation from pain. But that implies the negation of the will to live. For what is life, but insatiable desire and unsatisfying fruition, a pendulum moving backwards and forwards between effort ending in ennui and ennui urging on to fresh effort? To will is to want, and the essence of want is pain. Painless existence means, therefore, the extinction of all desire to prolong it, since the innermost nature, the kernel of every individual and of all things existing, is Will, which manifests itself in every blind force of nature, and also in the deliberate actions of man. 'For not only volition and resolve in the narrowest sense, but all striving, wishing, shunning, hoping, fearing, loving, hating—in short, all that constitutes our individual weal or woe, pleasure and pain—is manifestly nothing but an affection of the will.'<sup>1</sup> Therefore, to blot out all existence—i.e. to cease to will to exist—in all human intelligences, acting by common consent, would *ipso facto* destroy the universe, which according to the hypothesis only exists as a representation of the mind. But this voluntary renunciation of selfish wishes is not to be regarded as an encouragement to suicide; for, says Schopenhauer, that would only destroy the phenomenal individual, the transitory Will, not the immanent Will itself, whereas the 'ascetic mortification of the Will' is accompanied by sympathetic self-denial, endeavouring to reduce the suffering of others, in whom the unselfish man sees his own *alter ego*. Thus, in adding the 'sanctity of beneficence' to the holiness of joyful resignation, man becomes his own redeemer from sin and sorrow, and the saviour of society; the ills of life cease to exist for him, and he lessens them, as far as he can, in others until all ends in—Nothing. Upon the extinc-

<sup>1</sup> *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*, i. p. 131, ii. p. 225; and see the passage from St. Augustine in the note, taken from the *De Civitate Dei*, xiv. 6.

tion of every spark of wishing and willing in human hearts follows the consummation of all things, the perfect peace of non-existence. Such, paraphrased and condensed within the shortest compass, is the conclusion of Schopenhauer's line of thought, expressed in clear, forcible language—clear but dark as the pellucid surface of the Blackwater when it runs deepest.<sup>1</sup>

The pessimism of Hartmann differs from that of his master in many ways. The gloomy views of the morose misanthrope, living his lonely life during a depressing period of German history, forms a marked contrast compared with that of the buoyant, almost blithe, spirit of the later apostle of pessimism, possessed of a more cheerful disposition, sweetened by home joys, and writing under the exciting stimulus of a great national revival. Here we have the Philosophy of Despair toned down to suit the requirements of the hour—a due mixture of the Allegro with the Penseroso administered in judicious quantities so as almost to deprive pessimism of its bitterest sting. It is no longer the pessimism of indignation; it can scarcely be called the pessimism of sad resignation; it is rather the pessimism of placid acquiescence, though Hartmann's eschatological views of the universe coincide with those of Schopenhauer. But, as has been observed by some critics, these have the air of half-hearted adaptation to give completeness to the system.

The world, according to Hartmann, is the product of the Unconscious, which is=to the Will of Schopenhauer + Intelligence. At times it is personified in anthropomorphic fashion and called the 'Allwise Unconscious.' The original determination of the Unconscious to be manifested in actual existence was the work of blind will, but 'will to begin with is essentially unreasonable.' The unreason of the will to exist avenges itself in consequent unhappiness, the attainment of the reverse of what it aimed at. Reason comes to repair the blunder of unreasonable will.<sup>2</sup> The return to non-existence is the goal of Hartmann's philosophy, as it is that of Schopenhauer—only here it is brought about according to the approved political principles of this era of constitutional governments, *i.e.* by a decree of majorities. The majority of higher intelligences having become convinced of the worthlessness of life, and

<sup>1</sup> See, *e.g.*, the fine passage on the Peace of Nirvana, in *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*, i. pp. 486-7. For a masterly *résumé* and review of Schopenhauer's system, see Mr. Sully's work on Pessimism, especially pp. 84-103; also the article in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, *sub voc.*

<sup>2</sup> *Philosophie des Unbewussten*, ii. pp. 272-7; *ib.* p. 396; *ib.* pp. 410-411.

havin  
endea  
will.  
brisk  
utiliz  
mind  
the c  
the m  
ready  
a stat  
A  
this i  
best t  
tion,  
but to  
comp  
the W  
the S  
exhor  
worke  
alone  
• W  
every  
gious  
logica  
But th  
phrase  
the ca  
the tra  
a clear  
these  
tegrate  
Moder  
case.  
in rela  
the in  
indep  
nomy  
of aut  
laws w  
he gua  
the 'gr  
to a fo

having come to the conclusion that it is better not to be, endeavour to carry out this resolution by a suppression of the will. When in the course of time the process of culture now briskly going on shall have been completed, and by a wise utilization of all the means of nature, and the resources of the mind, the pessimist view of the universe now entertained by the cultured few shall have become the common property of the many, this leap into the dark will be made. Humanity, ready for the great act, will renounce life, and return again to a state of unconsciousness.

As a step towards it—and from an ethical point of view this is important—all are cheered on the way to do their best thus indirectly to pave the way for the final consummation, 'not to fold their hands in simple submission to pain, but to put shoulder to shoulder, working diligently with their companions in sorrow, to further the unconscious plan of the world, each according to his powers, and so to hasten on the Sabbath of the Universe.' 'Forward, then, cheerfully,' exhorts Von Hartmann, 'in the process of the world, as workers in the vineyard of the Lord, for it is this process alone that can effect the salvation of all men.'<sup>1</sup>

\* We have given so much space to Hartmann's system as on every point it touches upon religion. In fact such is the religious tone in most of his writings that by the confession of theological critics portions of his works might be read in churches.<sup>2</sup> But the evident aim of this studied adoption of Scriptural phrases and current theological expressions seems to be, as in the case of Positivist writers in this country, to render easier the transition from the old faith to the new. For in both cases a clear intention is expressed of supplanting Christianity by these new forms of religion. In the two works on *The Disintegration of Christianity* and *The Crisis of Christianity in the Modern Theology*, Hartmann plainly tells us that such is the case. Moreover, he occupies a decidedly antagonistic position in relation to religion in his expressed determination to destroy the theistic basis of ethics by supplying a system of morality independent of divine sanctions, to displace theological heteronomy by human autonomy: in short, in denying every form of authority in matters concerning morals except those moral laws which man evolves in the natural course of things. Yet he guards himself against the charges of pure naturalism. As the 'grave-digger of materialism' he compares his philosophy to a fortress between 'natural science and theology, between

<sup>1</sup> *Philosophie des Unbewussten*, ii. pp. 404-408; cf. *ib.* 306-309.

<sup>2</sup> *Zur Begründung des Pessimismus*, p. xvi.

a mechanical and a theistic view of the world, assaulted by both inimical armies.' Unfortunately, Hartmann in this erection of a philosophical Afghanistan, as a scientific frontier, not unlike the astute ruler of the actual Afghanistan in his avowed friendship towards one of the contending parties, does not always prove a trustworthy ally. Still, he who is not against us is for us, and in more than one respect pessimism may prove to be a valuable auxiliary to the cause of religion. For although from its negative and destructive side it is diametrically opposed to religion, yet viewed from the standpoint of its ethical idealism in its protest against the 'pseudo-morality' of selfish eudaimonism there is a hope—as Pfleiderer remarks in his closely-reasoned brochure on the subject (p. 51)—of its leading up to a real, *i.e.* an ethical, optimism. For both reasons, pessimism, as a philosophy, commands careful attention, for it endeavours to destroy the last vestiges of selfishness and selfish worldliness at the roots, and is never tired of preaching in season and out of season the duty of sympathy with our fellows and unremitting devotion to the common good. It strives to escape the narrow individualism of self-seeking in the universal aim of putting an end to the misery of mankind. Hence it never wearies in pointing out the causes of this misery, and often speaks in the manner of Christian philosophers, *e.g.* Pascal, endeavouring to show that this misery is owing in great measure to the contradiction between our lofty ideals and the imperfections of our actual attainments. Thus, again, the Scripture similes of the declining shadow, the vapour, the withered grass, indicative of life's transitoriness, recur in pessimistic poetry over and over again. The weariness of life expressed in the well-known sentences of Koheleth, as he dwells on the strange anomalies of human existence, find their counterpart in the writings of Schopenhauer and Hartmann—a disciple of the latter calls the book of Koheleth a Pessimistic Catechism. That 'man is very far gone from original righteousness' is also one of the articles of the pessimist creed, and numerous passages might be quoted from the writings of its professors in proof of man's fallen condition; but this is done too much in the spirit of misanthropic contempt of the race. Thus Hartmann quotes cheerfully and accepts as his own opinion the saying attributed to the great Frederick when some one mentioned human perfectibility: 'Ah, mon cher Sulzer, vous ne connaissez pas assez cette maudite race à laquelle nous appartenons.'<sup>1</sup> Schopenhauer says: 'Study to acquire an accurate and connected

<sup>1</sup> *Zur Begründung*, p. 25.



view of the utter despicability of mankind in general.' The latter quotes the 'Myth of the Fall,' as he calls it, as an expressive symbol of his own faith that human life is a punishment for coming into existence.<sup>1</sup>

Job's sad reflection that 'Man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upwards,' finds its echo among pessimists, but they (like Swift, who, without imitating the Patriarch's patience, celebrated his own birthday by reading on it the chapter in which Job curses the day on which he was born) are but too apt to adopt the tone of Christian saints and sages in describing man's sin and sorrow with an unpleasant admixture of sardonic and even savage pleasure, as when Schopenhauer says: 'The truth is we were intended for misery and are miserable.'<sup>2</sup> And in their delineations of suffering we look in vain for any trace of the Christian idea of the final extinction of sin and evil in a renovated universe.

The same might be said on the 'anticosmical tendency' of pessimism in its relation to the Christian idea of the world so far as it is alienated from God and called the 'wicked world.' No doubt numerous passages in Thomas à Kempis or Keble's *Christian Year*, in manuals of devotion, and in the whole range of sacred lyrics might be quoted in tone and tenor not very widely differing from some pessimist effusions *de contemptu mundi*.<sup>3</sup> But, then, Christianity looks forward to a world beyond this, and 'the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ,' and has nothing in common with the pessimist's theory of 'happy despatch,' expressed perhaps most aptly in the great poem of the nineteenth century, in a passage reflecting most faithfully its pessimistic tendency. It is Mephistopheles who says:—

'I am the Spirit that evermore denies,  
And rightly so—for all that does arise  
Deserves to perish;  
And better were it, therefore, it had never been.'

The principle of Christian resignation and the methods of giving it effect in passive acquiescence which naturally leads to quietism in some minds, and the frugal abstemiousness it recommends, which may degenerate into certain forms of asceticism, in others, is appropriated by pessimists who not unfrequently accuse modern developments of selfish and self-

<sup>1</sup> *Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*, ii. p. 666.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* ii. p. 663.

<sup>3</sup> See Thomas à Kempis, *De Imitatione Christi*, iii. 32; Keble's *Christian Year*, Wednesday before Easter.

indulgent Protestantism—sometimes not without reason—of having entirely departed in this respect from earlier and healthier forms of Christian life. Hence Schopenhauer's favourable mention of the Christian Mystics, *e.g.* Master Eckhard, whose famous saying on this point he quotes with approval: 'The swiftest beast to carry you to perfection is Pain.'<sup>1</sup>

We shall return to the subject as to what extent Christianity corrects and supplements the pessimistic view of the universe, and having said thus much on the mutual relation of pessimism and Christianity we may now proceed to the direct proofs on which pessimism rests its claims and the counterproofs by which it is assailed, with a view to see how far its position is shaken or made untenable by them, and what remains of it worth the consideration of the Christian philosopher or philanthropist grappling with the evils it brings before our view.

There are three lines of fortification, so to speak, behind which pessimism is intrenched: (1) the inner defences, consisting of subjective proofs as to the balance of evil over good in the amount of pleasure and pain they produce. (2) The next is the ethical argument, intimately connected with the first; it is contained in Von Hartmann's work on 'the development of the moral consciousness in special relation to burning social and ecclesiastical questions of the day' (which for this reason we have placed at the head of our paper in preference to his *Philosophy of the Unconscious*). (3) The historical proof founded on the palpable facts of social evolution. We will endeavour to put ourselves into the Pessimist's place, so as from his central position to command a better view of the strength or weakness of the inner circle of fortifications.

Is it possible, we may ask, to strike a balance approximately and on accurate scientific principles, of the pleasure and pain in the world, and is the balance of evil over good so clearly made out as to render the pessimist position impregnable? Are the debit and credit sides in the book of life filled up with such reliable figures that a single process of arithmetical addition on both sides will enable us to make out a clear balance-sheet at call? Are there no possibilities of erroneous entries? By what system of numeration can the quality as well as the quantity of pain and pleasure be measured

<sup>1</sup> *Welt als Wille*, i. pp. 478-480, 708, 728-9. For quotations from Scripture to prove this view, see Schopenhauer, *Welt als Wille*, ii. p. 718; Hartmann, *Philos. des Unbewussten*, ii. p. 355 sq. Such texts as Acts ii. 46, 47, expressive of Christian cheerfulness, are not found among those given.

amid the multiplicity and complexity of human experiences so as to affix in each case their relative values and exact ratios to the sum total of human bliss or woe? Take the events of one single day even in the quiet life of a country parson. Extended over a whole year, or a whole life, and still more over the life of humanity taken as a whole, it becomes a monstrous conception. And yet, says Schopenhauer towards the close of his great work: 'I do not think it will be difficult to strike the balance. In reality it is superfluous to quarrel over the amount of preponderating good or evil in the world; the existence of evil itself alone would decide the question; the good which exists by its side cannot cancel the evil.'<sup>1</sup> This is scarcely a scientific conclusion to arrive at as the final result of a careful arithmetical computation. As a matter of fact Hartmann, his own pupil, has pointed out some serious miscalculations in his master's statements on the relative amount of pleasure and pain in the world;<sup>2</sup> though he, too, after a painstaking process of induction, comes to a similar conclusion in his *résumé* on the first stage of illusion, *i.e.* the illusory hope of attaining happiness in this life as far as the individual is concerned.<sup>3</sup>

When we turn to the moral proof we find to our great astonishment Hartmann himself well-nigh cutting away the ground from under his own feet by the course of reasoning he adopts when speaking of moral evil. Thus he says: 'The purest and noblest blossoms of morality are to be found where the ammoniac of evil supplies the highest and strongest stimulants to its growth.'<sup>4</sup> We might add in the words of Pascal, quoted by M. Naville in his work on *The Problem of Evil*, that 'it is good to accustom oneself to profit by evil, since it is so common, while goodness is so rare.'<sup>5</sup> But if it be true, as Hartmann tells us in his over-eagerness to prove the superior value of the ethics of pain, that 'evil represents the pike in the carp pond of the moral order of things, which prevents the good carps from becoming lazy and so causing stagnation of the water in the pond by their inactivity,' we have here what he calls a 'teleological justification' for the existence of evil; though there would be little comfort in this,

<sup>1</sup> *Welt als Wille*, ii. 661.

<sup>2</sup> *Philosophie des Unbewussten*, ii. 296-7, 300-301, and *passim*.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 350-355.

<sup>4</sup> *Das sittliche Bewusstsein*, p. 592.

<sup>5</sup> *The Problem of Evil*, Seven Lectures by Ernest Naville, translated from the French by Edward W. Shalders, p. 279.

according to Hartmann's theory, since the carps and the pike alike are doomed to terminate their existence in that dead sea whose dark waters in the end will cover the just as well as the unjust. Still the argument as it stands is valid so far as it points out the medicinal virtue of pain and the disciplinary value of evil itself.

We turn to the third proof, the argument founded on the history of social evolution: 'When one has looked to the baseness of mankind,' says Schopenhauer somewhere, with the strange mixture of grim humour and pathetic tenderness which characterises his writings, 'and feels inclined to be shocked by it, one is forced at the same time to regard the misery of human existence. So, again, if appalled by the latter, we must turn to the former, and it will be found at last that they balance each other, and thus we see eternal justice vindicated since the existence of the world is its own judgment.'

How far does the course of human history bear out this pessimistic version of the historian's dictum that 'the world's history is the world's judgment'? Are 'malopejorists' right in their assumption that with the advancement of civilization human beings grow worse and worse, and that their misery increases in like ratio? No doubt with the progress of culture and refinement, new requirements creating new desires at the same time provide for new disappointments. The more complex our civilization grows, the greater, too, will be the number of demands which must remain unsatisfied, and thus a fuller development of human intelligence increases the chances of intensifying pain, whether caused by actual privation or anticipated suffering. As the highest organisms are exposed to greater risks in proportion to the delicacy of their framework, so a social system like our own with its complex differentiation of forms and functions contains innumerable elements of weakness and additional capacities for suffering unknown among the ruder societies of the past. Superior education is apt to produce greater nervous excitability in highly-wrought natures, while the increase of moral culture and with it the raising of moral ideals produce melancholy, irritability, and a susceptibility to mental agonies in noble souls who fail in their attainment, and mourn over the impossibility of bridging over the gulf between effort and fulfilment.

Social eudaimonism and evolutionary optimism are, therefore, rejected as illusory. Here, then, pessimism and scientific meliorism are brought face to face. In their views of life and immediate aims to lessen its evils they are fairly agreed, but

in their ultimate objects they differ. The happiness of the society of the future is the end in view for the scientific meliorist; the final extinction of the race when it shall have arrived at the highest point of intellectual intuition is the goal of the pessimist. Here, then, pessimism and scientific meliorism join issue, and it may be as well to change our stand-point so as to watch with more advantage the battle between them outside the citadel of pessimism and within easy distance of the three advancing columns of the enemy, led, respectively, by the ideal philosopher full of faith in the evolution of good out of evil; the hopeful philanthropist with his schemes for the amelioration of mankind, nothing doubting but that his works of charity will conquer at last every obstacle in the way of it; and the common-sense utilitarian, rather apt rudely to brush aside the pretensions of pessimism as cobwebs of diseased brains, and shrewdly surmising that all is for the best in the long run, and that a science of life based on experience will have a meliorating effect in the dim distant future. We may briefly consider the force of their respective arguments, taken collectively, though the first and last would require a separate paper to be treated exhaustively.

In the first place, then, the pessimist philosophy of history is accused of being lopsided, if not one-sided, in spite of its high claims to universality, because it deals exclusively with 'telluric materials,' and arrives accordingly at a purely geocentric view of the world, which implies the denial of cosmic or intelligent design. It becomes the '*Philosophie des Marasmus*,' a stick-in-the-mud theory of the universe, acknowledging no other power but the 'eternal necessity of matter;' and assuming that there is *no conscious* power in this worst of worlds, and no intelligent plan of evolving good out of evil, and so realizing the ideal of better things, though, as a fact as plain as any cognized by positive science, this ideal actually exists in the brain of the complaining pessimist as the justifying cause of his complaint. It is implied in all the destructive criticisms of optimistic views of the universe. The optimist's dogmatism on the harmonizing of discords in this best of worlds, where

'All our lives  
Are notes that fade and sink, and so are merged  
In the full harmony of being,'

may, as an actual picture of the world, be as false as it is fair. But the adverse critic himself has before his mind such an ideal all the time, and as a picture of his ideal world on the retina

of his mind it is a fact contrasting, indeed, with the imperfect reality of things as they are now, but not, philosophically speaking, excluding the notion of being realized later on.<sup>1</sup>

If, then, this modern civilization of ours be after all not so hollow at heart as the pessimist would have us believe, and the dissemination of his gloomy views is only to be regarded as a kind of *détour* of the human mind in search of the great secret of the universe, how far, it may be asked in the next place, is this mental aberration the result of 'our social constitution with all its terrible contrasts of want and luxury which pessimists assure us can only culminate in a social revolution'? This is the question the social reformer endeavours to answer and to solve in practical attempts to ameliorate the condition of certain social classes according to the ascertained principles of social science. In this way 'Scientific Meliorism' would bring back 'joy and zest in existence,' both among those who are condemned at present to indigence and dire want, and among those also who, as lookers-on, lose their own appetite in the feast of life because so many others are cruelly excluded or expelled from 'the banquet of the nation.'

Philanthropists of this turn of mind have an unlimited belief in the inherent possibilities of social improvement. Thus Miss Clapperton, whose work, as the work of a lady, combines the excellences and faults of female authorship—the power of detailed presentment and generous warmth, with excess of feeling and diffuseness at times bordering on irrelevancy—says in the preface of her book: 'The possibility of evolving superior social conditions is, to my mind, a scientific certainty dependent on psychic effort' (p. xi). 'The nineteenth century stands, I believe, on the threshold of a new form of social life and on the eve of a new departure. . . . My aim is practical. By the study of evolution I think it possible to guide the thoughtful and earnest in our midst to personal conduct which will tend to bring about a happier social state' (p. 49). To the evolutionist who combines the power of 'intellectual clearness' with 'emotional beneficence' nothing is impossible. A lucid apprehension of the social forces at work and their causes and antecedents, together with a ready will and the wisdom which comes from knowledge to direct and extend them—in other words, 'science and public spirit'—will enable him to hasten on the 'halcyon days of man's future.'

The successive steps towards bringing all this about are as succinctly stated on p. 140 in the following 'order of evolution':—

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte des Materialismus*, von F. A. Lange, ii. p. 541-45.



'These are, first, that in this sphere of feeling the path of advance toward greater happiness lies in fostering the sympathetic and repressing the anti-social emotions ; second, that love of property must be modified and subjected to reason ; third, that jealousy is anti-social and must die out ; that love of truth and the sentiment of justice are of recent growth, and demand general attention and aid in their development ; and fifth, that the sentiment of what is proper and improper in conventional society is no true guide to right conduct.'

This is a much brighter prospect than that presented by the pessimist. Pessimism as a social system, withal lamenting the imperfection of our social institutions, despairs of reforming society, and whilst announcing grimly the coming revolution, as an alternative, it expects nothing but evil from it, whilst Scientific Meliorism presents a far more rational view of the ultimate outcome of evolution than that contained in the pessimist hypothesis.<sup>1</sup>

It is unnecessary to linger on this comparative view of the 'Ultimatum of Pessimism,' which Mr. Barlow, with grim Hibernian humour, calls the 'Blister, or Poultice Theory of the Universe.'<sup>2</sup> We pass on to the common-sense view of the practical man, who has little sympathy with the 'grotesque absurdities' of pessimistic eschatology, and almost as little with the fervid enthusiasms of scientific meliorism, though he is willing to admit, in a rough-and-ready sort of way, that all will end well, and that all is for the best.

Such a one lays his finger at once and unsparingly on the weak points of either hypothesis, and it will be well to consider his line of argument before we close the discussion. The practical man shows, to begin with, how vague and misleading are such collective terms as the happiness of humanity of the future, used by pessimists and meliorists alike, though they differ as to the methods of improving the condition of the humanity of the future. When we are called upon to make that the sole object of our present endeavours, it is well to remember that humanity means a number of human beings, and social happiness represents 'a mere set of ciphers,' having no meaning until we put a 'unit of personal happiness' before it. In other words, collective happiness means the happiness of individuals in the aggregate. But it does not follow that individuals will be quite happy or happier even if society is improved. The confession of J. S. Mill is adduced by Mr.

<sup>1</sup> *Philosophie des Unbewussten*, pp. 396-7 ; and *ib.* pp. 375-90, on the third stage of Illusion = the Illusion of Scientific Meliorism to effect human happiness socially.

<sup>2</sup> *The Ultimatum of Pessimism*, by J. W. Barlow, p. 26 ; *ib.* 82-3.

Mallock, in his work entitled *Is Life Worth Living?* to show that even noble minds who entertain this better hope are not thereby freed from a melancholy pessimism which, being temperamental or constitutional, is past cure *ipso facto* (p. 28). From this it is inferred that no amount of social melioration can effect a perfect cure from pessimistic melancholia which amounts to a psychical taint or a congenital idiosyncrasy.

Besides this, our prudent man of the world shrewdly suspects a certain amount of affectation in hugging grief to one's breast, and in the pleasure to be found in the luxury of grief, which has produced a species of *Luxuspessimismus*, a disposition not dissimilar to the pettishness of spoiled children. And the worldly-wise man is not very far from the truth in not taking the professed pessimist too much *au sérieux*.

In the same way, says our common-sense philosopher, ignorance of human nature and the plain facts of moral consciousness in average humanity, are at the root of that 'moral dyspepsia' which, in its contempt of the wholesome food of ordinary morality, holds up an impossible standard of altruistic self-extinction, as when Schopenhauer speaks of the lifting of the veil of Maja, which will enable each individual to see himself in his fellow, and to make his fellow's sufferings his own, and thus cheerfully to sacrifice his own happiness to that of his next-door neighbour by a total 'abnegatio sui ipsius.' Or when scientific meliorism, following in the wake of pessimism, makes it our chief duty to bring about the happiness of the people, say, of the twenty-fifth century, at the cost of any amount of pain to ourselves and the men and women of this and successive generations. In all this the practical man sees nothing else but distorted views of life and duty, with denials of human happiness in the present, unwarranted by the general consensus of mankind, and unreasonable hopes of social, contingent on moral, amelioration in the future, resting on exaggerated views of human perfectibility.<sup>1</sup> There is much truth in all this, but it is not the whole truth. In many respects the aspirations of pessimism and scientific meliorism rise superior to the practical aims of the common-sense egotist, moving on a lower level. It is in the system of Christian ethics combating egoism, and teaching true altruism, that we must really look for reconciliation of the contradictions of life which produce pessimistic views, and for the stimulus to effect the reformation of morals and manners which are to bring about that great deliverance which pessimism is sighing for and searching after in vain.

<sup>1</sup> *Welt als Wille*, i. 447, 480, ii. 695-9; cf. Sully's *Pessimism*, 344-50.

This brings us to the last point of our discussion, the consideration how far pessimism may be regarded as an ally or an antagonist of religion, and how far the latter may be able to modify the aspirations of pessimism and scientific meliorism in eliminating what is false from what is true, and directing aright minds in their enthusiasm led astray by mistaken aims. As Taubert, the first wife of Von Hartmann, in her *Apology of pessimism*, written under her own name before her marriage, rightly boasts, theoretical pessimism in its antagonism to modern materialistic aims is of the utmost importance as an ally of positive religion.<sup>1</sup> Its iconoclastic rudeness in demolishing the idols of the market, and its often unfeeling, though not unerring, diagnosis of life's illusions, have done much to modify, not only 'the silly, intemperate optimism of the last century,' but also the foolish deification of worldly success and the self-idolatry of the age we live in. It has served, as the biographer and editor of Schopenhauer's works truly says of his master's teaching concerning the renunciation of the world, as 'a wholesome damper on the eagerness of life and the hasting and running after earthly happiness which characterize our own times.'<sup>2</sup> In this matter pessimism is on the side of Christianity, militating against what those religious pessimists of another age, the Gnostics, termed *καταχρησθαι τῷ κόσμῳ*.<sup>3</sup>

Again, pessimism and Christianity occupy common ground in accentuating the importance of the discipline of pain, though they may differ as to the wholesomeness in degree of the chastening effects of self-castigation. Hence Schopenhauer's sympathies with the Christian mystics, like Francis of Assisi and Filippo Neri; with Madame Guion and Fräulein von Klettenberg, Goethe's ideal woman in *The Confessions of a Beautiful Soul*; even with the Trappists, the most severe of religious orders, placed in the heart of France, he thinks, to counteract the opposite extreme of light-heartedness of her people. But mysticism and asceticism form the meeting-place of all noble spirits who reach rest and spiritual refinement in resignation, and through sadness, sorrow, and suffering are taught noble resolves—

'He conquers that awaits the end,  
Who dares to suffer and be strong.'

<sup>1</sup> *Der Pessimismus und seine Gegner*, von A. Taubert, p. 143; Pfeleiderer, *loc. cit.*, pp. 49-50.

<sup>2</sup> A. Schopenhauer: *Lichtstrahlen aus seinen Werken*, von Julius Frauenstädt, pp. v-vi.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. 1 Corinth. vii. 31.

But here, too, in the view of the sanctifying efficacy of suffering and death, there is a wide difference between Pessimism and Christianity. Self-mortification through life, and cheerfulness in waiting for the end, self-denial and self-devotion even to the extent of laying down life for the brethren, were taught in the religion and exemplified in the life and passion of Christ. But these forms of self-mortification, self-abnegation, and self-devotion differ vastly from what pessimism understands by these terms. Pessimist self-mortification is a means of escaping the mortifications of existence; the pessimist welcomes death as the silent brother of sleep to lull us into the eternal slumber of non-existence, and the pessimist denial to live arises from a strong desire to put an end to individual chagrin and so settle the quarrel with life for ever. Again, in the Christian scheme death and birth are not mere transitory vibrations in the permanent life of the race, nor death 'a kind of apotheosis,' or assumption of the individual life—<sup>1</sup>

'Mixed and merged  
In the smooth mystery of perpetual being.'

Self-abnegation here is a means to an end—*via crucis, via lucis*—and though 'none of us liveth to himself,' and in this sense 'whosoever will lose his life shall find it,' yet this does not imply the giving up of the '*principium individuationis*.'<sup>2</sup> 'For me to live *is* Christ, and to die *is* gain,' says the same Apostle, who also dwells most emphatically on personal identity in speaking of the change effected by the resurrection, so that he sees in a denial of personal continuation beyond the grave the ground of the worst form of pessimism, 'If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men *most miserable*.'

The idea is also contained in the following lines of Wordsworth's *Excursion* (book v.) :—

'Life, I repeat, is energy of love,  
Divine or human; exercised in pain,  
In strife, and tribulation; and ordained,  
If so approved and sanctified, to pass,  
Through shades and silent rest, to endless joy.'

Here we are on the confines of transcendental optimism, with which this paper is not directly concerned, and we are warned to turn to the question what pessimism and religion have in

<sup>1</sup> *Welt als Wille*, ii. pp. 548, 732, 735-6; *ib.* i. pp. 461-3.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the Prayer in Thomas à Kempis, *De Imitatione Christi*, book iii., ch. xv.

common, in regarding the world of human beings as an object of redemption. They agree in one important point: 'the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain with us until now.' Pessimists err in excess rather than in defect in the exhibition of sympathy and pity for suffering wherever discovered, and in its sighs of relief in giving full expression to its overpowering sense of the world's sorrow are contained the real consolations of pessimist philosophy. But as by its own hypothesis social eudaimonism is illusory, the fervour of altruistic duty must be constantly checked by the doubt of success in alleviating the pain and ameliorating the fate of the objects of this compassion. Are we not ready to say here, in the words of another Lake poet, in view of an earlier form of pessimism:—

'Praise, praise it, O my soul! Oft as thou scann'st  
The sluggard Pity's vision-weaving tribe!  
Who sigh for wretchedness, yet shun the wretched,  
Nursing in some delicious solitude  
Their slothful loves and dainty sympathies!  
I therefore go, and join head, heart, and hand,  
Active and firm, to fight the bloodless fight  
Of science, freedom, and the truth in Christ.'<sup>1</sup>

Unless there is this faith, the fight with sin and sorrow is not likely to end in victory. The scientific meliorist, conscious of the fact that the ideal which can inspire social action to any purpose must be the lasting improvement of social life by social and other agencies, tells us 'that all that is wanted is the *conscious* cultivation, enlightened by science, of society as a whole,' and that 'we are now in a position to pursue human wellbeing as a conscious aim, with good prospect of success.' But he denies 'the capacity for sacrifice regardless of self,' and the power of being 'completely altruistic, "hoping not again,"' to a large number of his fellow-men. As in one place he tells us that this altruism, 'the taproot of social morality,' is congenital, and in another insists on the invariability of our moral nature, so that if we are selfish no teaching will persuade us to act unselfishly, and if we are generous, loving, and heroic we move towards self-sacrifice by a natural gravitation<sup>2</sup>—and in this opinion Pessimists agree with him—it must remain a matter of ominous uncertainty which will prevail in the end—whether all good done in the 'Service of

<sup>1</sup> Coleridge, 'Reflections on having left a Place of Retirement.' The lines were written under great domestic affliction.

<sup>2</sup> *The Service of Man: an Essay towards the Religion of the Future.* By the late James Cotter Morison, pp. 262, 266; *ib.* 306 and *ante*.

Man' is to be swallowed up by the 'wave of egoistic passion,' or all the evil done under the sun is to be submerged by the 'counter-wave of altruistic emotion.' From which we conclude that the hope of the scientific meliorist is not much brighter after all than that of the pessimist, that neither is able to raise man out of the 'Slough of Despond,' because in their appeal to man to work out his own salvation they are unable to add 'For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to work, for His good pleasure.'<sup>1</sup> In their 'anthropocentric' view of the universe there is no room left for a Deity. The anthropomorphic will of Schopenhauer's ideal system, the 'anthropopathic' spirit of Hartmann's Philosophy of the Unconscious, and the 'anthropolatry' of the Religion of Humanity, one and all rigorously exclude every form of Theism. Having lost their faith in the God in whom we live and move and have our being, they have with it lost the courage and hope which it inspires. Like stoicism, modern positivism contains both the elements of pessimism and scientific meliorism as the outcome of a sceptical age.

'Stoicism thrived because, like Christianity, it is a philosophy of suffering; it fell because, unlike Christianity, it is a philosophy of despair.'<sup>2</sup> Pessimism and the scientific meliorism of positivism are destined to fail for the same reason.

### SHORT NOTICES.

*Athos, or the Mountain of the Monks.* By ATHELSTAN RILEY, M.A.  
(London: Longmans, 1887.)

THIRTY-SEVEN years ago there appeared in the *Christian Remembrancer* an article entitled 'The Monasteries of Athos.' Referring to Mr. Curzon's then recently-published book, to various other publications—English, French, Russian, Romaic—and to 'a manuscript journal' and 'notes of visits' made in the preceding year 1850, the accomplished writer presented an account, at once full, succinct, and luminous, of that 'Hagion Oros' of which Dean Stanley afterwards said that 'no one who had not visited it could write fully of the Greek Church.'<sup>3</sup> We wish that our space would allow us to make extracts from this

<sup>1</sup> Phil. ii. 13, R. V.

<sup>2</sup> *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria.* By Charles Bigg, D.D. Bampton Lectures, 1886, p. 241, note.

<sup>3</sup> *Lectures on the Eastern Church*, p. 16. He refers to 'an excellent description in the *Christian Remembrancer* for April 1851.'



article: we must content ourselves by saying that it gives a vivid description of the physical as well as the ecclesiastical conditions of the celebrated Macedonian promontory which even in Herodotus's time<sup>1</sup> had taken its name from the 'pointed mass of white bare rock in which it terminates seawards,' and which is now crowned by a little 'chapel of the Transfiguration.' The writer tells us that 'the entire peninsula' has been in the hands of monks from a period long preceding the Ottoman conquest. There are twenty monasteries, represented in 'a kind of federal council or synod: of these societies ten only are now cœnobitic,' the other ten having lapsed into what is called the 'idiorrhythmic' system,<sup>2</sup> according to which the monks live as individuals instead of in community, with a body of elders and elected officers instead of a superior or Hegoumen. There are also various detached cells—'kelleia' or 'kathismata'—which in ten instances are aggregated into groups called 'scetes,' the two largest being dependencies of 'the chief monastery called the Lavra.' In 1851 there were, we are told, some 2,800 monks in Athos; and the writer indicates as a chief motive for their adoption of the monastic life, with its monotony and its privations, the desire of rest, not only nor chiefly, as in old times, rest for the soul, but 'rest from Turkish oppression, from unprofitable labour, from infinite exactions and extortions.'

We will detain the reader no longer from Mr. Riley, who is well known as an Eastern traveller and an active promoter of the 'Mission to the Assyrians or Chaldæans.' In company with his friend, the Rev. Arthur E. B. Owen, and provided with a commendatory letter from the 'Œcumenical Patriarch,' he spent the greater part of August and the first half of September, 1884, in a visit to the 'Holy Mountain,' and made the round of its religious houses, beginning at Vatopedi. His readers will gain from his lively narrative an abundance of information, not only as to glorious scenery and picturesque architecture, but as to the interior condition of the monasteries and smaller monastic settlements. They will learn not a little of monastic phraseology; besides the explanation of such terms as we have mentioned, they will hear of a 'calyvi' (cottage), which is 'like a small kelli, but has no chapel attached to it,' and is inhabited by a hermit (p. 119); but we infer from p. 225 that the word is sometimes used for the abode of two or three hermits with 'a little church' attached to it. They will meet with the word 'caloyer,' which perhaps they first encountered in *Childe Harold*, and which signifies a professed monk, as distinct from a 'dokimos' or novice, literally probationer.

'The caloyers,' says Mr. Riley, 'are divided into three grades: "*rhasophoria*," "*the little habit*," and "*the great habit*."<sup>3</sup> But very few

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus, vii. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Riley was told that this idiorrhythmic plan 'was the more economical, and was led to infer that when the monks worked for themselves individually, they accomplished more than when they laboured for the common weal.' What would St. Benedict have said of this?

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Ducange's *Glossarium med. et inf. Græcitas*, vol. ii. col. 1284, and Goar, *Euchologion*, p. 472. The *Euchologion* identifies the 'little

enter this, the highest monastic grade, which entails almost complete withdrawal from earthly things and a life devoted to religious exercises. The great majority of the Athos monks belong to the second grade, of the little habit, though many assume the great habit on their death-bed.

(Rhasophoria, we should add, means properly, wearing the 'rasum,' or poor or rough garment). The reader may be already familiar with such terms as 'bema, naos, narthex, diaconicon, prothesis, iconostasis;' he may know that 'phaenolion' means a chasuble, and 'stoicharion' an alb; he may learn besides that the term 'altar' is used by Greeks for the whole sanctuary, the altar itself being called the holy table; that stalls are called 'stasidia,' a corona is called a 'polyelaos,' a corporal an 'antimins,' a principal church a 'catholicon,' a side chapel a 'parecclesia,' while churches within and without the walls are respectively termed 'esoclesia' and 'exoclesia.'<sup>1</sup> The dedications are often significant: they indicate Greek reverence for the Holy Archangels, the Honoured Forerunner, the Panaghia, the Forty Martyrs, the Three Hierarchs (SS. Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom), the Holy Unmercenary Ones (two canonized physicians), St. Nicholas, St. Spyridion, St. George, SS. Constantine and Helena, and the prophets Daniel and Elias. Of the 'outer churches' belonging to the convent 'of the Almighty, one is named after' St. Athanasius the Great, the other after St. Athanasius of Athos, a Georgian, who 'founded the Lavra in 963-4.' Mr. Riley gives us an interesting account of the 'holy, patriarchal, and royal monastery of the Iberians,' founded a few years later by three Iberians or Georgians. It has eighteen 'interior churches,' one skete, and forty kellia; its 'chief literary treasure' is a tenth-century MS. of the first translation of the Scriptures into the Georgian tongue, made by Ewthym, one of the three founders; Mr. Riley gives an interesting letter from the librarian to Prince George of Georgia in 1817 (p. 141. Here Euphemius appears to be a misprint for Euthymius). Much may also be gathered, and not a little inferred, from the account of St. Panteleemon's or Russico, now 'the headquarters of the Russians' in Athos. Mr. Riley had said in an earlier chapter, that in the Athonite Synod 'party feeling runs high on the great Russian question.' He afterwards affirms that 'the history of the Russian colonization of the Holy Mountain is one dismal story of abuse and confidence, hypocrisy, bribery, and machination; and that the Greek monks complain that the Russians have firmly established themselves' there 'under false pretences.'

'The danger which they fear is, that Russia will claim the promontory as her own, when sufficient Russian subjects have been imported to outnumber the Greeks, and that thus a great blow will be struck at the authority of the Œcumenical Patriarch and at the pre-eminence of the

habit' with the mandyas, a large flowing cloak, 'usually of black stuff' (King, *Rites of the Greek Church*, p. 38).

<sup>1</sup> But Mr. Riley is a little inaccurate in calling the bishop's throne 'synthronus.' That term properly denotes the seats of the priests with the central seat of the bishop.

18  
G  
Pa  
th  
tru  
pr  
Co  
for  
Ap  
of  
Ma  
On  
it  
Ru  
dec  
tha  
ent  
per  
mo  
cre  
'bu  
ma  
had  
ple  
lim  
who  
the  
clur  
the  
pref  
effe  
it i  
serie  
wea  
rate  
peni  
bran  
may  
cent  
their  
'St.  
of m  
conv  
saly  
living  
1  
2  
3  
Mr. I  
VO

Greek Church; the ultimate aim of the Russians being to remove the Patriarchate to Moscow, or in some other way to subject the mother to the daughter Church, and both to the Czar and his ministers. . . . It is true that the Greek Church, coextensive with the Greek nation, would prove a great obstacle in the way of the Muscovite appropriation of Constantinople, or other parts of the Turkish Empire where the Greeks form the larger part, or even a considerable minority, of the population. Appreciating this fact, the Russians may well wish to break the power of the Church—a task of such magnitude, that even the conqueror Mahomet II. shrank from undertaking it' (p. 243).

On the other hand, Mr. Riley admits that

'it is even probable that the Greeks are jealous of the greater number of Russian than of Greek pilgrims to the Holy Mountain (caused by the deeper religious feeling that exists among the lower order of Russians than amongst the Greeks)—pilgrims who make the journey, I believe, entirely from religious motives' (p. 249).

The Greek statement about Russico is, that the Russians, in 1839, persuaded its Greek hegoumen, Gerasimus, to admit eighteen Russian monks, 'promising in writing that their number should never be increased beyond fifty,' which would be one-third of the whole body; 'but afterwards, by means of bringing servants from Russia and making them monks, they increased their numbers until, in 1869, they had reached 400;' and then, 'having got simple old Gerasimus completely into their power, they tore up the compromising document limiting their numbers, and through the abbot expelled all the monks who opposed their schemes;' and 'in 1876 the present abbot bribed the last patriarch to support the Russian interest,' &c.

This story touches on one great practical corruption which has clung for ages to the chief Oriental see. It is a subject from which the friendly Western will, as far as possible, avert his eyes. He will prefer to think, under Dean Church's guidance, of the wonderful effect which Christianity has produced on the Greek race by training it in 'national endurance, national sympathy, national hope,'<sup>1</sup> in seriousness, stedfastness, tenacious spiritual loyalty; 'if it has not weaned it from some of its most characteristic sins,' it has, at any rate, 'saved it,' let us hope, for a brighter future. This 'monastic peninsula' has been called, by the writer in the *Christian Remembrancer*, 'the very heart and kernel of the Eastern Church.' One may think such a title deserved when one remembers how, within this century, the influence of Athos has led two renegades to confess their faith at Smyrna and Adrianople, and to win their crowns as 'St. Agathangelus and St. Timothy' among the 'white-robed host' of martyrs;<sup>2</sup> or how, in 1818, one of her monks, named Gideon, a converted Turk, was *chopped to pieces by order of the Pasha of Thessaly because he refused to deny Christ*. . . . There is one old monk still living who remembers him.<sup>3</sup> The Eastern Church may well hold such

<sup>1</sup> Church, *The Gifts of Civilization*, &c., p. 134 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Riley, p. 372. *Christian Remembrancer*, April 1851, p. 343.

<sup>3</sup> Riley, p. 295. We commend this case to such admirers of Islam as Mr. Isaac Taylor.

Athonite saints in honour. But we hope that elsewhere within her vast domain capacities of revival and invigoration are becoming manifest, which as yet seem dormant amid the mediæval atmosphere which Mr. Riley, like other travellers, has found pervading the cells of Athos. We do not insist on the careless keeping of libraries;<sup>1</sup> few of the monks have been sufficiently educated to appreciate them, and Turkish extortion may often have compelled a sale of books which, in a way, had been valued. Nor can we wonder, all things considered, at the monks' dislike of 'taxing their memories,' at indifference to history or ignorance of theology, or simple retentiveness of such legends as the baptism of Constantine by Sylvester. What strikes one, on the whole, is an appearance of quiet, contented formalism in regard to the higher aspects of conventual life. Services of immense length are gone through punctiliously, and at Russico with dignity and exactness (p. 254); but we do not get an impression of spiritual energy or devout fervour.<sup>2</sup> Occasionally a chief officer in a monastery delights the English strangers by showing a serious interest in 'the Anglican Church;' or members of the synod utter a prayer for 'unity,' or even discuss (with the help of Greek visitors) this or that point of controverted doctrine; or prelates and monks witness with interest the celebration of the English liturgy. 'The Oriental fear and hatred of the Papal pretensions' are emphasized. Mr. Riley finds that a hit at Rome is always acceptable: 'transubstantiation' is asserted, but without any intended reference to the scholastic theory which it implies; even the Anglican absolution of the sick is criticized as 'showing a Latin influence;' the Archbishop of Cavalla, a prelate who accompanies our travellers, and who expresses this objection, is so good as to admit that *all* Roman priests are not immoral, but takes an evident pleasure in asserting that, 'according to our doctrine, the Pope of Rome himself is neither more nor less than an unbaptized layman, and if he joined our communion would have to be baptized, because we do not allow baptism by aspersion, nor, except in cases of sickness, by affusion.' And here we get a curious glimpse at Eastern notions of 'economy:' a Western postulant for admission to the Eastern Church, at Constantinople or Athens, would be told that he must first be baptized, *i.e.* by triple immersion; if he 'rejected this

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Riley found more appreciation of books at Russico, Vatopedi, and Pantocratoros than at three or four other houses. At Chiliandari he could not see the Evangelistarium of white vellum with golden letters, which Curzon had so much admired, because the monk who had the key of the press which enclosed it was 'away in the vineyards.' He says, with some simplicity, 'We always tried to impress upon the monks the importance of having separate buildings for their books' (p. 296). Little would they reckon of a Frank's advice to take more trouble! When he asked the monks why they did not insure their buildings against fires, their reply was always the same—'It had never been the custom to do so' (p. 136).

<sup>2</sup> 'It is not the austerity, but the fervour, which seems to be wanting; and as this is just the thing of which a chance visitor can least surely note the presence or absence, it becomes us to speak modestly on the subject.' *Chr. Rem.* l. c.

injunction, and travelled to St. Petersburg,' the Russian Church would receive him *as if he were baptized*, just as she receives Lutherans and Poles, by an exercise of 'economy ;' he would then be confirmed, and allowed to communicate in Russia, and therefore at Constantinople or Athens (p. 110). We must add, although we say it with reluctance, that Mr. Riley was extraordinarily complaisant to his hosts in regard to the belief in relics and wonder-working icons. In fact, he expresses himself on such subjects with a crudeness which seems to us unfortunate. He treats supposed portions of the true Cross as most likely genuine (pp. 60, 170) ; he regards praying for a cure before the icon of Our Lady the Portress as parallel to Naaman's faith in Elisha's word, and ironically refers to 'three other cases of Oriental superstition,' meaning the miracles recorded in 2 Kings xiii. 21, Acts v. 15, xix. 12 (p. 285). It does not seem to have occurred to him that by this piece of smartness he was playing into the hands of unbelievers. He exhorts his Western brethren, 'without abandoning their love of truth, to believe before questioning' the stories of miraculous icons or relics, although he speaks severely about some tales as 'false ;' at one monastery he considers himself bound to 'reverence' what yet he admits to be the 'extremely doubtful relics' of the 'gold, frankincense, and myrrh,' because 'the Church of the country, whose jurisdiction I recognize, says to me in the person of the abbot, "These are the gifts of the Three Kings." ' He credits the Greeks with 'the evangelical virtues, faith, obedience to ecclesiastical authority, and reverence,' and leaves Englishmen in possession of 'the natural virtues, truthfulness, honesty, and . . . uprightness.' This sort of talk is doubly mischievous ; it lowers and narrows the idea of 'evangelical' sanctity, and it ignores the pregnant fact that truth, justice, and the like, have been spiritualized and quickened by the power of a supernatural motive, so that we injure Christian morality if we treat them as a mere affair of the 'natural man.' They are *inside* the sacred area ; they make demands on the serious moral effort of Christians as such ;<sup>1</sup> they rebuke Christians, however orthodox, who fall short of them. Again, Mr. Riley applauds the answer given by Oriental to English Non-juring bishops, who had scrupled at the Oriental cultus of Mary : 'Here we may fairly cry out with David, "They were afraid where no fear was !"' But he forgets to quote what they added, in a tone too like that of the extremest Roman Marianiser, that 'our Lord is the Mediator of our reconciliation,' but 'the Saints and the Mother of God' for post-baptismal forgiveness and for deliverance from ordinary evils.<sup>2</sup> And he presents to us, as 'excellently describing the Catholic position,' a statement by Mouravieff, including the words : 'The Orthodox Church, since the earliest ages of Christianity, has glorified the Blessed Virgin . . . supplicating her as the most powerful mediatrix with the Lord' (pp. 304-6).

Familiar as Mr. Riley is with Eastern Church rites, he seems at

<sup>1</sup> Liddon, *Univ. Sermon*, i. 324.

<sup>2</sup> See G. Williams, *The Orthodox Church in the Eighteenth Century*, p. 54.

a loss to explain one which he saw in the chief church of Caryes, and describes as 'some sort of service for the dead' :—

'In the middle of the church, on a table, were placed a candlestick holding three candles, and a plate of boiled rice . . . with raisins, and a candle stuck in the middle. We all had little tapers given to us, which, at a certain point in the service, we lighted one from another. Three or four priests and two deacons with censers stood round the table, and each one read through long lists of names' (p. 277).

This is evidently the service performed 'in remembrance,' after a requiem on certain days after the decease, and on the 'name's day and anniversary of the death of the deceased.' As Madame Romanoff says, in her vivid *Sketches of the Greco-Russian Church* (p. 242), 'they take boiled rice and raisins, sweetened with honey, to church in a basin . . . and place it, with a taper stuck to it, on the little black *naloy* (reading-desk), before which requiems are sung.' The rice with its adjuncts is supposed to typify the Resurrection.

We have yet another word to say as to drawbacks from the enjoyableness of this book. It can hardly have received that *retractatio* for which a 'proof,' not to say a 'revise,' gives opportunity. Otherwise we should not find the apocryphal second Esdras attributed to a 'prophet' (p. 280), nor 'the Apostle' quoted as having said, 'He that marrieth doeth well, but he that marrieth not doeth better,' a perversion of 1 Cor. vii. 38 which the listening 'monks and servants' were not likely to correct (p. 240). Nor would 'euphemistically' have kept its place where the word required was 'euphoniously' (p. 133). Nor would the undoubted 'mixture of grotesqueness and religion' at Athos have been allowed to warrant some bits of slang and jaunty facetiousness which strike us as the reverse of opportune and graceful. Thus, in an introduction of personages : 'Now, Peter, off you go with a salaam, and make room for your betters. . . . Lastly, there is your humble servant ; well, perhaps the less said about him the better ;' 'A pretty fuss there was until the Archbishop's stick was recovered ;' 'So they popped the old gentleman' (a dead abbot) 'back again into the hole ;' 'Odds trenchers and knives, how we ate !' 'We munched our dry bread—ugh ! wasn't it gritty ?' 'O—would contradict me flatly if I said he was as cross as two sticks that evening ;' and so on. And we think that a Churchman who at times gives utterance to pious aspirations after intercommunion with the East, might have refrained from telling us how, on two occasions, he condescended to the *mauvaise plaisanterie* of practical jokes on two poor young monks of Athos (pp. 157, 317). *Dulce est desipere in loco*, but not *extra locum*. We may, however, set against these flippancies the pleasure given by illustrations 'mostly engraved from the author's photographs.'

*A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.* Edited by PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D. Vols. IV. and V. (Buffalo: The Christian Literature Company, 1887.)

THE fourth and fifth volumes of the American Library of the Fathers contain the writings of St. Augustine against the Manichæans, Donatists



and Pelagians. The first-mentioned section includes seven works, of which four have already appeared in the same rendering in Clarke's series; the remaining three are Englished for the first time by Dr. Newman, Professor in the Baptist College, Toronto. We cannot honestly congratulate Dr. Newman upon all parts of his translation. To take an instance quite at random—'*Sed sic ut quamdiu manent in peccato ad sese alias occulta quadam suasionem traducant*' does not mean 'But in such a manner that for a long time they remain in sin and by a certain occult suasion traduce to themselves other souls.' Dr. Newman's Introduction appears to us so very much better than his translation, that we should have conjectured that they came from different hands if his name had not been prefixed to both. But why must Dr. Newman go out of his way to assail Rome when nothing in his subject leads that way? He will have it that the doctrine of indulgences is fully developed in Manichæism, and asserts that the germs of it appear in the Catholic Church before the time of Mani. But the doctrine of Mani is, that a certain class of persons may, without absolute loss of salvation, lead a sensual life if they occasionally resort to the ascetic observances which a higher class practise habitually. Even if there were in this theory the ascription of the merits of the higher class to the lower, which Dr. Newman thinks he discerns, it would still not be the doctrine of indulgences at all. And we do not know where Dr. Newman finds his germs of indulgences in the Catholic Church before the third century. A passage or two about the requests of the lapsed to the martyrs for intercession that their penance may be shortened are all that Berington and Kirk can allege in favour of indulgences from that period. And, lastly, even if the Manichæan and Roman doctrine were the same, and were contemporaneous, the fact would be quite irrelevant, since, as Dr. Newman himself observes, nothing Christian appears among the conditions of Manichæan discipleship at all.

The anti-Donatist writings are rendered by the Rev. J. R. King, vicar of St. Peter's, Oxford, and are enriched by a clearly-written Introduction by Dr. Hartranft, of Hartford. The anti-Pelagian works occupy the whole of the fifth volume, and are taken entirely from the series of Mr. Clarke. They appear to be well translated, and a very full and laborious Introduction precedes them from the pen of Dr. Warfield, Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton. We cannot complain that the editing of this section of Augustine's works should have been committed to one who feels himself in strong sympathy with their predestinarianism. But we think Dr. Warfield widely astray in the remarks with which he concludes his essay. 'The theology of grace [*i.e.* the predestinarian principles of Augustine] was destined in the hands of his successors, who have rejoiced to confess that they were taught by him, to remove this stumbling-block [the damnation of unbaptized children] from Christian teaching;' and again, 'It is only because of Augustine's theology of grace, which places man in the hands of an all-merciful Saviour, and not in the grasp of a human institution, that men can see that in the salvation of all who die in infancy the invisible Church of God embraces the

vast majority of the human race—saved, not by the washing of water administered by the Church, but by the Blood of Christ administered by God's own hand outside of the ordinary channels of His grace.' We have here a great deal of confusion. The 'ordinary channels of God's grace' seem to be in the enormous majority of instances superseded by a dispensation of His grace, of which we have no difficulty in being perfectly certain not only as to its existence but as to the persons to whom it is dispensed. Surely, if this be so, the ordinary means must be those which save the majority, and the sacraments which only concern the minority must be the extraordinary means. But, what is still more unreasonable, we have predestination, which is an inscrutable act of God behind all human acts, and leaving them their own efficacy in their own sphere, treated as a known fact on the same plane with human actions, and pronouncing on the validity or invalidity of these for the purpose to which they are directed. Baptism may be necessary or unnecessary, but predestination has no more to do with the question whether it is or not than with the question whether sermons or Bible-reading or eating and drinking are necessary in their respective spheres. Accordingly, Calvinists, to whom baptism appeared not to be necessary to salvation, have frequently believed in infant damnation on an immense scale. It is certainly a curious discovery that by throwing in all who die in infancy as *ipso facto* predestined to salvation you can make out a vast majority of the saved. To our minds every gift of God's grace given by baptism or any other means leads one to hope for His mercy to those who have, without their own fault, been excluded from receiving them; just as the bounties of a rich man at his castle gate would lead us to hope that he would send something to those who could not attend there.

The three succeeding volumes will contain the expository works of St. Augustine, and the possessor of the eight will have at hand, in a very handsome form, a most valuable store of the best patristic divinity. But we hope Dr. Schaff will curb the propensity of his sub-editors to embody their own ecclesiastical prepossessions and enmities in their Introductions. If his Anglican contributors all proceed to state their theories with the same freedom as the gentlemen of other communions are doing, the various Introductions will not be in harmony. This, however, is a small matter in comparison with the correctness and readableness of the translations, and, with the exception above noted, we think there is nothing to complain of in this respect.

*Dante's Divina Commedia: its Scope and Value.* From the German of FRANZ HETTINGER, D.D. Edited by H. S. BOWDEN. (London: Burns and Oates, 1887.)

FATHER BOWDEN and his coadjutors deserve the thanks of the English reader for this translation of Dr. Hettinger's essay. The work is a valuable introduction to the study of the *Divina Commedia*; for though it discusses the poem mainly from the standpoint of the theologian, it also brings out the historical and political aspects, the beauty of the style, the unity of purpose, and the *consensus partium*.

The keynote, however, is sounded at p. 50, where the author, himself an eminent Roman Catholic Professor of Theology, says that Dante wrote as a theologian, as a poetic Thomas Aquinas. The essay is in effect a vindication of the poet's orthodoxy in matters of faith, doctrine, and practice, minus the *amari aliquid* of his (to Dr. Hettinger's mind) unsound views of the relation of the Empire to the Papacy. By adducing the internal evidence of the poem itself, supplemented by that derived from Dante's other works, and by large quotation from the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas and the writings of other Fathers, the conclusion, which few will dispute, is arrived at, that the poet was in all essential points a true and devout son of the Church.

As a rule, Dr. Hettinger is very fair in his comments and his deductions. There are, however, instances in which his ecclesiastical bias makes him put upon the text meanings which were clearly not in Dante's thoughts. A few of these may be pointed out. At p. 187 we are told that Matilda 'may typify' 'perhaps the priesthood, through whose instrumentality we are brought into the Church, the earthly Paradise.' But, a few lines further on, we learn that 'the earthly Paradise signifies the state of original justice, to which the Church alone can restore man;' and that the Church itself is symbolized by the triumphal chariot drawn by the mystic gryphon—Christ. Now, of course, this chariot does typify the Church, which cannot therefore be the earthly Paradise, into which the chariot is drawn; and it follows that Matilda cannot represent the priesthood. Again, at p. 307, it is assumed that in *Par. v. 61* (Cary's translation) Dante speaks of the religious vow of perpetual chastity as that which—

' So precious in the balance weighs,  
That all in counterpoise must kick the beam ;'

whereas *all* vows of a specially solemn subject-matter—'*qualunque cosa tanto pesa*'—are referred to. At p. 310 Dr. Hettinger says: 'The religious life'—*i.e.* in the technical sense of the life of the religious Orders—'is a life of prayer, and so Dante extols the sweet sound of the bell, which calls the bride of Christ to matins.' But anyone who refers to the passage cited (*Par. x. 134*) will see at once that the 'spouse of God' alluded to is not a nun—or, as Father Bowden would say, 'a religious'—but the Church. Nor is the statement at p. 316, that God inspires with the desire for baptism a heathen who fulfils the moral law as far as he can, borne out by the passage adduced from *Purg. xiii.*, where Dante merely says that the three theological virtues availed, *in baptism's stead*, for the redemption of Ripheus. Once more, the gloss put upon *Par. iv. 67* by Dr. Hettinger at p. 301, viz., that 'heresy' 'often springs from a vain endeavour to fathom the divine mysteries; and, as these are impentrate, the heretic in his stubbornness rejects what should be humbly accepted,' is whole poles apart from the meaning of the original:—

' Parere ingiusta la nostra giustizia  
Negli occhi de' mortali, è argomento  
Di fede, e non d' eretica nequizia.'

We may add that the true sense of these lines is flatly contradicted by the Editor (Preface, p. vii) in making Dante say that heresy comes from a desire to measure divine by human justice.

Before quitting this topic, we must point out an error at p. 103, where Dante is credited with the statement that 'hither'—*i.e.* to Hell—'where "guilt hath no redemption," at the heels of an infuriated beast, are dragged the lost souls,' &c. Whereas this is said only of the manner of the death of Corso Donati (*Purg.* xxiv. 83).

Dr. Hettinger is obliged to deal with Dante's fierce attacks upon individual Popes; his theory of the Empire; and the fact that the *De Monarchiâ*, which embodies it, was placed upon the Index by the Council of Trent. He touches the first of these matters with a very light hand, but appears to admit that Popes, as men, are liable to err. But he comes to the singular conclusion (p. 353) that Dante's attacks on the Popes are a defence of the Papacy itself, since it is the very dignity of their office which makes any fault in a Pope so conspicuous! We expected, after this, to find him say that the *De Monarchiâ* was placed upon the Index as a testimony of the orthodoxy, and value to the faithful, of Dante's other unimpugned works. The explanation of that step, however, which he does give, is not of much more cogency. It seems that (p. 359) it was not a condemnation of the author as a teacher of heretical views, nor even a censure. The decree of the Council of Trent merely prohibited the book as liable to be dangerous in the hands of the enemies of the Church! The reflection naturally arises, Why was the book thus dangerous, unless heretical?

Dr. Hettinger fairly admits—and, in the face of the *De Monarchiâ* and the critical Canto xvi. of *Purgatorio*, how could he do otherwise?—that Dante held that the Empire and the Papacy were two independent divinely-ordained authorities: one for man's temporal welfare, the other for his eternal salvation. He attempts to combat this view by adducing the opinion of Dante's contemporary, Gervase of Tilbury, to the contrary, viz. that the Empire was the creation of the Papacy; and by himself maintaining that the coronation of Charlemagne as Emperor by Leo III. was the creation of a new empire by the Pope, and that the consecrating sanction of the Church implied a limitation to its sway (pp. 360, 361).<sup>1</sup> We should have thought that the consecrating sanction of the Church no more implied the creation or limitation of the sanctioned office than the coronation of an English king by the Archbishop of Canterbury implies that the monarch owes his throne to the prelate. And we fail to see how anything non-existent can be 'sanctioned' by calling it into being. Dante, moreover, wrote the *De Monarchiâ* against the views held by Gervase of Tilbury and those who thought with him. Hence, it would be as fair to cite his authority against them, as theirs against him. Neither can be of any inherent weight against the other.

We cannot conclude this notice without pointing out the Editor's flagrant unfairness to Dante (see the Preface at p. x). After saying

<sup>1</sup> At page 361 we find the strange misquotation of the motto on the seals of the German Empire:—'*Roma caput mundi regit frena orbis rotundi.*'

(correctly enough) that the poet sees in the *German Emperor*, the then 'one powerful *opponent* both of the *French king* and of the *Sovereign Pontiff*,' the saviour of Italy, and in his universal empire the salvation of mankind, he thus proceeds—the italics are ours—'But Dante *lived to see his wishes carried out*. Clement V. withdrew from Rome, and placed the Holy See under the tutelage of *France*, with what result in Dante's eyes? Why, that the Church in her secular aspect was robbed of her freedom, dignity, and purity, and became like a mere state establishment, "*una puttana sciolta*." To say that Dante's wishes were carried out by the aggrandizement of Philip the Fair of France—the '*feroce drudo*' of the '*puttana sciolta*;' the '*mal di Francia*' of *Purg.* vii. 109—whom, his house and his policy, Dante more cordially detested than, perhaps, all other men and things, argues either an ignorance of the historical facts, or a perverse ingenuity, which we should not have expected to find in Father Bowden.

*Cosmopolitan Essays.* By Sir RICHARD TEMPLE, Bart., M.P., G.C.S.I., D.C.L., &c. With Maps. (London: Chapman and Hall, 1887.)

MORE than five-and-forty years ago Dr. Arnold of Rugby declared that we wanted not so much books on directly religious subjects, as on secular subjects treated in a religious spirit. That there are plenty of essays, to say nothing of poems and works of fiction, of an irreligious character is only too obvious, and consequently needs no proof. Nevertheless Dr. Arnold, if he were alive, would find cause for rejoicing in a number of publications calculated to gratify his desire for good-toned literature. He would have been much pleased, we fancy, to look at the list of treatises on all sorts of subjects issued by the venerable Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and the similar line adopted by its younger companion, the Religious Tract Society.

The handsome volume of essays by Sir R. Temple is a real accession to our stock of books of this character. Like Ulysses of old, Sir Richard is one (if we may adopt the Horatian version of Homer's line)

Qui mores hominum multorum vidit et urbes.

India, Canada, the United States, Egypt, Palestine, Greece, China, Burmah, Afghanistan, and the basin of the Congo—on all these subjects, and on the British empire at large, he is prepared to impart abundance of information well arranged for popular use; and in the majority of cases he is able to speak from personal observation.

It is not to be expected that our author should not at times come across questions on which good and gifted men are at variance. Thus, for example, he appears to approve of the policy of Lord Lytton in opposition to that of the Duke of Argyll in respect of Afghanistan, and he regards it as an error that England did not persist in carrying out a military movement which might have avenged the death of Gordon at Khartûm. These are topics which we do not propose to discuss, and it must suffice to say that Sir R. Temple has treated

them with much ability, candour, and good temper. He has, we imagine, a large measure of sympathy with the general tone and policy of the late Sir Bartle Frere. But his concluding words in the sketch of that colonial governor will not only give a fair specimen of Sir R. Temple's style, but show that he does not allow himself to be carried away by his admiration into indiscriminating eulogy: Frere having perhaps, in our author's judgment, displayed a tendency towards a somewhat excessive belief in the right of England to rule the world at large, or, at any rate, all of its uncivilized races.

'He [Frere] desired empire for the sake of abstract good, and not for selfish aggrandisement. He gave them [the native tribes and races] the most favourable impression of the British character and of practical Christianity. He made them believe in their own capability of improvement. He lifted them, as it were, out of Oriental prejudice and bigotry, tenderly leading them into better spheres of thought and morality. . . . With everyone, of whatsoever race or tongue, he had the unfailing charm of a mild, modest, and refined bearing. His conversation and manners inspired everyone with an interest in his fame and achievements. . . . That he was faultless or free from error will never be asserted by discriminating friends. He himself would have been the last man to make such an assertion or to dream such a vision. For he was from first to last a humble-minded Christian. So powerful an individuality, so marked an idiosyncrasy as his, must necessarily have had co-ordinate defects, which in human nature are almost invariably allied with great virtues and merits. We may apply to him the words which a contemporary applied to a British hero—

"He was true English;  
His virtues and his failings English all."

Lastly, we may associate with his memory the words of a well-known author respecting the promise that "finally in death itself their sleep should be sweet upon whose tomb it could be written *Obdormivit in Christo*" (pp. 183-4).

Another good example of the judicial character of the volume may be found in its author's estimate of the strong and weak points of the United States. We have known cases in which travellers from our own shores have returned from a brief visit to America with the impression that the author of *Martin Chuzzlewit* would still be justified in declaring that the greater part of conversation in that country might be summed up in one word—Dollars. Now Sir R. Temple allows that culture stands at a disadvantage in a young country; that 'men are expending their nervous force and their brain power from morn to eve,' and that 'when they return home they are too tired to attempt any fresh mental recreation.' But still he is strongly of opinion that culture is steadily gaining, and will continue to gain, and that 'nowhere is mere wealth without personal gifts so ineffectual as a passport to the best society as in the American capitals' (pp. 469-472).

They must be indeed singularly well-informed persons who can lay down this book, without being obliged to confess that they have gathered a large amount of useful and trustworthy information from its pages. For one feature we, as Christians, feel especially grateful. Nothing is more common than to hear, from the sciolist in such



matters, the assertion that missionary efforts have practically effected nothing. Very different is the verdict passed by men of real knowledge and thoughtful observation, such as the late Sir Charles Trevelyan or Sir Bartle Frere, or (among the living) Lord Dufferin and Sir Richard Temple. The ninth chapter, that on 'Christian Vernacular Education for India,' brings this out most strongly.

'I am bound to say that, notwithstanding all shortcomings, nevertheless a large measure of success has been vouchsafed to Christian missions in India. Of course you will hear disparagement. The course of Christian missions would indeed be weak if it could not bear the impact of the very light disparagement you occasionally find. But all these taunts and sneers are just like the froth of the waves which dash against the rock of fact. It is a fact that missions have wrought a success which can be proved by statistics that reflect honour on the English name. The native Christians are now to be counted by hundreds of thousands. The native children that are undergoing Christian instruction in missionary schools are also to be numbered by hundreds of thousands. And there is steady increase, also by hundreds of thousands, in succeeding decades, so that the hundreds of thousands will ere long become millions, until at last the number will grow so heavily on our hands that we shall hardly be able to cope with it' (p. 191).

Sir R. Temple proceeds to prove from statistics the growing need for a native ministry. The whole chapter deserves careful study, and we must remember throughout that this particular address is very specially the result of personal observation. Possibly we might feel some of the recognized difficulties more strongly than our author; but for all that we feel most grateful for his testimony, and rejoice to find so distinguished a public servant doing so much good by his pen as well as by his career of active life.

*The Epistle to the Romans, with Notes Critical and Practical.* By the Rev. M. F. SADLER. (London: George Bell and Sons, 1888.)

WE hail with pleasure this addition to the commentary on the New Testament which Mr. Sadler evidently contemplates, and which we trust he will have health and strength to complete. We have noticed the volumes on the four Gospels and on the Acts of the Apostles as they appeared, and it is a great satisfaction to know that the success which they have achieved and the considerable circulation which they have obtained encourage the author in the task congenial to him. If anyone looks in this volume for learned disquisitions on the text, or a careful balancing of the opinions of eminent commentators, he will be disappointed. Mr. Sadler's object is quite different from this, but we should leave a wrong impression if we did not add that difficulties both of construction and interpretation are always examined and solutions given, and in such cases reasons for agreeing with, or differing from, opinions ordinarily received are very lucidly stated. The aim of this volume is to place in the hands of churchpeople who are anxious to be assisted in arriving at the full meaning of Holy Scripture notes which may be of service to them;

and whilst these 'notes' may be read with advantage by all who are interested in Biblical studies, they will be found more valuable by those who desire a commentary for devotional rather than critical purposes. There can be few, if any, of our readers who are not acquainted with some of the excellent books which Mr. Sadler has published from time to time. Their special characteristic is that they are written with a singleness of aim and directness of purpose which go far to recommend the conclusions contended for. Difficulties are boldly faced, not evaded, and the reader is made to think whether he does or does not agree with the views of the author. The line of thought which pervades this commentary on the Epistle to the Romans is thus set forth by Mr. Sadler in the preface :—

'The purpose for which St. Paul was directed by God to write this Epistle was entirely connected with the great controversy or struggle then going on respecting the Church, whether it was to be a Catholic body, on its inner or spiritual side the mystical body of Christ, inheriting all the privileges of the Sion of the Prophets, or whether it was to be an appanage of Judaism. On the settlement of this controversy hung all the future of the Church as One, Catholic and Apostolic. The purpose of the Epistle, it seems to me, was to assure the Gentiles that being justified by faith they possessed the only true justification, and having accepted Christ, and been grafted into Him as the true Vine and Divine Olive-tree of grace, they were the true elect people of God.'

With this master-key, as it seems to him, in his hand, he interprets the difficult passages respecting election found in this Epistle. He comments upon them at considerable length, and always in a devout spirit and with a directly practical purpose.

As our object is to call the attention of our readers to a book which we feel sure they would be glad to possess, and to point out generally the lines on which the commentary is based, and not to criticise its several parts, we forbear from saying more than that we think this volume will certainly sustain the high position which Mr. Sadler has gained as a practical interpreter of Holy Scripture.

*The Dispensation of the Spirit; being Readings on the Person and Work of the Holy Ghost in relation to the World, the Church, and the Individual.* By the Rev. C. R. BALL, M.A. (London: S.P.C.K.)

THIS little treatise is of a simpler and more popular character than, e.g., Mr. Hutchings's book—a work, by the way, of which, so far as we have noticed, Mr. Ball makes no use, although he acknowledges his obligations to most of the other English books on the same subject, and 'has enriched his pages with quotations from the sermons of Cardinal Newman and Bishop Moberly, from Archdeacon Hare's *Mission of the Comforter*, and from the writings of other well-known authors' (p. vi), besides being indebted, as he tells us, for the substance of two entire chapters and part of a third to Cardinal Manning's *Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost*. It is divided into four parts, treating respectively of (1) the Eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost, (2) the Temporal Mission, (3) the

Presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church, (4) the Presence of the Holy Spirit in the Individual Christian; and at the close there is a suggestive chapter on the Progressive Witness of the Spirit. Each of these subjects is well and carefully discussed, and the reader will find much excellent material here brought together in a small compass and in an attractive form. But while we give a cordial recommendation to the work as a whole, we are desirous to point out two instances of inaccurate language which ought certainly to be corrected should a second edition be called for. On page 50 we find the following statement: 'Our Saviour speaks of sin against the Holy Ghost as being of such fearful malignity as to be beyond the reach of pardon both in the present and in the next succeeding age.' The mistake is a very common one, but is none the less a mistake. Our Lord never says that 'sin against the Holy Ghost' is unpardonable. He does say (as is pointed out by Waterland in his admirable sermon on the subject) of one particular sin, which He specifies as 'the blasphemy against the Spirit,' that 'it shall not be forgiven.' The difference may seem but slight, but it is an important one, and if only writers and preachers had always been careful to avoid the use of the inaccurate and unscriptural expression, 'sin against the Holy Ghost,' those unhappy misconceptions of the nature of what is called the unpardonable sin might not have been so common as they are now. One other word there is which we should like to see altered. It is the word 'separate,' which is more than once applied to the Persons of the Holy Trinity: e.g. on page 20 we are told that the Holy Spirit is revealed as 'a separate Person,' and a little lower down the Father and the Son are spoken of as 'separate from one another in Person.' What Mr. Ball means is, of course, 'distinct,' but that is not exactly the same as 'separate.' The two words cannot be treated as convertible terms, and the use of 'separate' in speaking of the Persons of the Blessed Trinity should always be avoided as dangerous and likely to lead to misconception of the Church's doctrine. It is, however, only fair to add that these are the only blemishes which we have noticed, and they can easily be remedied in another edition.

*Legends and Records of the Church and the Empire.* By AUBREY DE VERE. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1887.)

MR. DE VERE'S new volume of poems is likely to sustain and extend his literary reputation. There is 'a sweetness long drawn out' in his verse, and few can be familiar with it without learning much, and becoming wiser, more catholic, and more tolerant from what he learns. The present volume divides itself, as is suggested in the title, partly into poems that deal with the history, and partly into pieces that give in poetical forms some of the legends of the Church. We think that the higher literary value belongs to the former class, though we can well imagine that to many minds the free and imaginative treatment of the legends will prove more acceptable. In addition to these, and partaking of the same characteristic, are some short pieces, and an Ode on the crowning of Charlemagne and the Holy Roman Empire. With the history and literature of the Church up to the

era of Charlemagne, Mr. de Vere is especially well acquainted. That Holy Roman Empire was the result of the fusion of the barbaric races with the Roman Empire. Mr. de Vere holds with Mr. Allies, in his *Throne of the Fisherman*, that there is one especial period that compares with the efflorescence of the golden age of Greece, the space of time between Athanasius and Leo, 'both great writers, but men in whom the greatness of character surpasses the greatness of mind. Almost the whole wealth of patristic literature lies between these two.' Mr. de Vere has thoroughly saturated his mind with the literature and history of the period, but he goes beneath these to the roots of things. In the course of a somewhat long, but interesting and instructive preface, he says:—

'An eminent German philosopher has remarked that it was not by any material antagonist of its own order that pagan Rome was overthrown; it was by a power of a sort wholly alien, and one which Rome had at once recognized as her foe. It was Christian Love. That principle had taught the martyrs to die, while the philosophers could only dispute; it had made a Thecla face the lions, and St. Jerome find a palace in his cell. A Divine Love had added tenfold to the strength of human love (while apparently restricting it) by redeeming it from the bondage of self-love through the discipline of self-sacrifice. As a consequence, the Family had once more asserted its primal dignity as the author of all social existence, and the root of all political order; the "Kingdom of Christ," the great representative of Divine Love, stood up thus as the universal Family of Man, and the only truly universal empire revealed itself as a spiritual empire. "The Cross had conquered," for from it alone could have issued forth that divine love, the principle of life in a new-created world. The commotions of that world, while it was gradually taking shape are, as we revert to them in remembrance, but the storm-lights and shadows which chase each other over a plain, while the real life works on in the herbage beneath' (p. xxiii).

In dealing with the Holy Roman Empire, he speaks of the well-known essay of Professor Bryce, M.P., whom he considers 'a far more candid authority on this subject than Gibbon.' Naturally enough he has no great affection for Gibbon, and quotes with satisfaction a judgment of Coleridge in the *Table Talk*: 'That poor scepticism which Gibbon mistook for Socratic philosophy has led him to misstate and mistake the character and influence of Christianity in a way which even an avowed infidel or atheist would not and could not have done. Gibbon was a man of immense reading, but he had no philosophy.' These poems have a reminiscence about them of Tennyson's historical poems, such as *Cobham* and *Columbus*. Of the historical poems in the volume we prefer two on Constantine—*Constantine in Thrace*, *Constantine at Constantinople*: Constantine being in each case the speaker of the monologue. In the same way *The Death of St. Jerome* is supposed to be spoken by him while he was on his death-bed at Bethlehem, attended by the second Paula. Another of these historical poems is called *Stilicho*, who, though a Vandal, had the greatest veneration and affection for the Roman Empire, and would have preserved it for the sons of Theodosius if it had not been for the jealousy of the Roman nobles and the treachery of the Emperor

Honorius. A Gothic chief suddenly appears at a Roman banquet, rehearses the great acts of Stilicho, upbraids them with their ingratitude, and announces that Alaric is within two days' march of Rome, which he has vowed to destroy. Another poem is called *Amalasunta*. She was a daughter of Theodoric the Great, the Gothic king of Italy, and after her father's death, the Regent, during the childhood of her son. The rebellious Gothic chiefs sent her to the pestilential island of Bolsena, where, without waiting for her slow death, they murdered her. In the still morning, with a presentiment of her death upon her, she meditates on her father's career, especially over his judicial murder of Boethius and Symmachus, and of his persecution of those who held the Catholic faith, which, although an Arian, Theodoric had always treated with respect. Then there is a poem called *S. Boniface*, a monologue or meditation in a German forest, while his companions had retired to rest in the heat of the day. There is a hint of his coming death by the stream Borduc, where he was murdered with all his fellow-workers. Most of our readers will have seen the stately tomb of the Apostle of Germany in the great cathedral of Mainz. Of the poems of this order, as we have said, we prefer the two that are concerned with Constantine. Let us use an illustration to explain the preference. If we take a group of works relating to the battle of Senlac and its surroundings, say Mr. Freeman's History, Lord Tennyson's drama, and Lord Lytton's novel of *Harold*, we will venture to say that, although the historian alone goes into details, yet we obtain a more vivid and simple idea from the novelist or poet. We may have read a great deal about the history of Constantine, yet we perhaps may get a better idea of the personality of the man from Mr. de Vere's two poems. The points that chiefly strike one in his history are his miserable postponement of baptism till shortly before his death, and his presence at the Council of Nicæa. We take an extract almost at random :—

‘Of Religions one remains ;  
The rest are dead Traditions, not Religion.  
The old gods stand in ivory, stone, and gold  
Dozing above the dust-heaps round their feet ;  
The Flamen dozes on the altar-step ;  
The People doze within the colonnades ;  
The Augurs pass each other with a smile ;  
The Faith that lives is Christ's. Three hundred years  
The strong ones and the wise ones trod it down ;  
Red flames but washed it clean—I noted that :  
This day the Christian Empire claims its own.  
The Christian Empire—stranger things have been ;  
Christ called His Church a Kingdom. Such it is ;  
The mystery of its strength is in that oneness  
Which heals its wounds and keeps it self-renewed.’

Sometimes in a long piece of composition the movement becomes somewhat pedestrian. Occasionally, too, in his heroic metre he introduces an Alexandrine line, so entirely apart from any view to effect that we suspect that it has been the result of carelessness or rapid writing.

Mr. de Vere succeeds so well in the sonnet that it is remarkable that he has written so few. Here is a gem on 'Saint Emmelia'—

*Her Convent on the Iris in Pontus.*

'Not for thy snowy peaks, thy woods that wave  
Where rolls thy Iris on in swift career ;  
Not for thy mountain floods that downward rave  
Thy river-breadths shattered o'er ledges sheer ;  
Not for the gems thy myriad streams that pave ;  
Not for roe-haunted glade or shadowed mere ;  
Not for green lawn, blue gorge, or ivied cave ;  
'Tis not for these that Christians hold thee dear,  
Thou Pontic Paradise ! In Pagan days  
Beauty was thrall to Pleasure or to Pride :  
Earth's beauty her Emmelia sanctified  
Teaching wild wastes to sing their Maker's praise ;  
Here first *her* Basil taught his Rule austere ;  
Asia's monastic life was rooted here.'

This is graceful and melodious poetry ; but we are afraid that Mr. de Vere has not strictly met the requirements of the true Italian sonnet. English sonneteers, from Shakespeare downwards, have refused to limit themselves to the exact law of the sonnet.

There is one kind of sacred composition which our author seems not to have attempted, and in which Faber and Cardinal Newman have succeeded so well—the hymn—the simplest, most difficult, and most elevating form of poetry. We could hardly have quoted less from Mr. de Vere's volume, but our limits do not permit us to quote more. It is a book which no one will regret storing up amid the *κειμήλια* of literature.

*The Nibelungen Lied.* Translated from the German by ALFRED G. FOSTER-BARHAM. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1887.)

FROM Mr. Foster-Barham's preface he would appear to have published his verse-translation of the *Nibelungen Lied* under the impression that his was the first attempt to make the great German epic known to English readers in that form. By this time he has doubtless discovered that Mr. W. N. Lettsom has been first in the field by some thirteen years. It is to be hoped that some day the 'force of Nature' may 'make a third' out of these two translators, who shall combine the merits of each, and do for the *Nibelungen Lied* what Judge O'Hagan has done for that far inferior work the *Song of Roland*. Lettsom's style is too antithetical and sophisticated to render the naïve simplicity of his original. Mr. Foster-Barham has caught the true note of style with great success, but he is too inattentive to his metre. The metre of the *Nibelungen Lied* is, indeed, not one of its chief merits ; but it lends itself well to chanting, which was doubtless its original method of *Vortrag*. 'Like the swing of an axe,' Demosthenes said of Phocion's oratory ; and the *Nibelungen Lied* has reminded us often of that comparison. But Mr. Foster-Barham's lines will neither chant well nor read well ; they are not more uneven than the original, but they want the elastic strength which lifts the reader without check over the



rough places. Both translators, we may add, have thought good, for reasons best known to themselves, to disregard the normal lengthening of the fourth line in the original stanza.

Yet, in spite of Mr. Foster-Barham's shortcomings in this direction, and of the more or less momentous errors in translation, whereof an attentive reader might detect a dozen or so, we must regard his translation as a fairly adequate presentation of the *Nibelungen Lied*. With this rendering, with Mr. Lettsom's (which is accompanied by a useful introduction and notes), and with Mr. Ludlow's excellent and racy prose version in his *Popular Epics of the Middle Ages*, Englishmen have no excuse for not making acquaintance with the great epic of their race—'by far the grandest of epics since the *Iliad*,' as we agree with Mr. Ludlow in considering it. In it 'beauty lies in large masses,' and is not to be apprehended by the microscopic eye. And if we discard the microscope, Mr. Foster-Barham must be judged to have done well, and not least in this, that he has grasped the individualities of the different characters in the *Lied*. They live in his pages as in the original—Chriemhild, so feminine, gentle, and affectionate in the first part of the story, till changed by her wrongs, as such simple natures do change, into a fiendlike creature, as single-hearted in her fury as in her love—Hagen, with his fierce, suspicious temper, his indomitable energy and intellect, his scorn of scruples, his redeeming trait of devotion to his lord—the lord himself, Gunther, too bad to be respected, and too good to be successful—Rudiger, the mild, faithful, valiant Markgraf of Attila. In this power of exhibiting characters, in the artistic excellence of its plot, and in its sober and saturnine Teutonic humour, lie the chief claims of the *Nibelungen Lied* to pre-eminence among the numerous epics of mediæval Europe. The plot, indeed, cannot easily be matched for constructive skill. From that first trifling act of vainglory, when Siegfried gives to Chriemhild the trophy he had won from her brother Gunther's wife, we are led irresistibly, yet most naturally, onwards through scenes of ever-deepening crime and desperation, to the slaughter of the *Nibelungen* in Attila's hall, a conclusion than which all fiction offers nothing more tremendously impressive. The strife of these powerful, primitive natures is like a combat of wild bulls; and yet how far above that it is placed by the touches of tenderness, or chivalry, which give nobility to the most savage scenes of the story. Yet nowhere perhaps is the writer's tragic power shown more clearly than in the episode which ends the poem, in Hagen's dungeon, after he and Gunther, sole survivors of the massacre, are taken prisoners. 'Where,' demands Chriemhild, 'is the hiding-place of the treasure, the Nibelung Hoard, which Siegfried won, and which you took from me after his murder?' 'That,' replies Hagen, 'I have sworn never to reveal while my lord is alive.' Chriemhild departs; in a few minutes she returns, holding her brother's head by the hair.

Then is the moment of Hagen's triumph. 'Well I knew,' he cries, 'what errand you would go on—now my lords are all dead, Gernot and Giselher and Gunther, and the secret is mine and God's alone. From thee, devil's wife, it shall be right well hidden for ever.' And

so the poem closes, with a revelation of supreme hatred yet more appalling than the picture of Attila's blazing hall, with its falling rafters quenched in a lake of blood. Chriemhild slays Hagen, and is instantly slain herself by one of her own vassals, horror-struck at her ferocity. Thus :

'Mit leide was verendet des Küneges hōchgeizt,  
Als ie diu liebe leide an dem ende gerne git.'

It is a pity that the sweetness and sadness of this last line have been so poorly rendered by both the English translators. It is almost the only reflection in the whole of the epic, and the only glimpse it affords into that gulf of melancholy thought in which most of the world's great artistic creations have taken shape.

Let us conclude by quoting a few stanzas which give a favourable example of Mr. Foster-Barham's powers. Gunther has just resolved to ride forth for the wooing of Brunhild, and begs Chriemhild to see after that very important element of success in such an enterprise—the provision for himself and his retinue of new and gorgeous apparel :—

'To him replied the maiden: "Brother mine, so dear,  
If in aught I can help you to your purpose here,  
So shall it soon be proven that to do so I am glad,  
Were others to misserve you, so were Chriemhilda sad."

Then took their leave the princes, with kind and courteous mien,  
Now quickly to her maidens called the lovely Queen ;  
Thirty damsels chose she from her circle fair,  
Who for such skilled working showed a talent rare.

On silks from far Arabia, of soft and snowy sheen,  
And priceless *Zazamanker*, all as the clover green,  
The jewels they embroidered : that gave a mantle bright ;  
The Lady Chriemhild shaped it with her own hand so white.

The skins of foreign fishes they used with quaint device,  
Such as in that country were strange to people's eyes,  
The which with silk they covered, as fitting was to be :  
Now listen to great wonders of this apparel gay.

From kingdom of Morocco, and eke from Libya,  
Of silks the very rarest that anyone e'er saw,  
In courts of mighty princes, of these they had to spare ;  
Well showed the Lady Chriemhild how she had them in care.

Since they for this journey such costly robes required,  
Skins of ermine chose she, such as were most desired,  
Those where 'mid coalblack softness many a white spot lay,  
Such were by gallant Recken worn at feastings gay.

Many a precious jewel glanced from Arabian gold ;  
Scant leisure had the ladies, that must in truth be told,  
Within the seventh week their work all finished lay ;  
His weapons well re-burnished many a Recke gay.'

*Histoire de la poésie liturgique au moyen âge. Les Tropes.* Par LÉON GAUTIER. Vol. I. (Paris : Palmé, 1886.)

M. LÉON GAUTIER, to whom we are indebted for so many important works on mediæval lore, has recently published the first volume of a learned treatise on liturgical poetry; it is entitled *Les Tropes*, and is a valuable contribution, not only to the history of ecclesiastical literature and hymnology, but to that of monastic life. In the first place, what is a *trope*? We give M. Gautier's answer: 'A trope (L., *modus, tropus, cantus*) is the interpolation of a liturgical text; it is the insertion of a new and unauthorized text in an authentic and official one.' An example will best illustrate the author's meaning; we take it from the *Introit* to the Mass for Christmas Day, printing the trope in Roman letters and the official reading in italics:—

'Gaudeamus hodie quia Deus descendit de cœlis, et propter nos in terris *Puer natus est nobis, quem Prophetæ diu vaticinati sunt Et filius datus est nobis.* Hunc a Patre jam novimus advenisse in mundum *Cujus imperium super humerum ejus, potestas et regnum in manu ejus, Et vocabitur nomen ejus Admirabilis, Consiliarius, Deus fortis, princeps pacis, magni consilii angelus.* Ps. *Cantate Domino canticum novum, quia mirabilia fecit. Gloria Patri, &c.*

The above extract will show that the *tropists* expanded the contents of the breviary and disturbed all the arrangements of the Gregorian liturgy; we have selected it from a number of quotations given by M. Gautier (p. 3), quotations to which we refer the reader. The epoch extending from the ninth to the twelfth century seems to be the one during which tropes particularly flourished; they were found in the collection of hymns, and throughout the (chiefly monastic) churches of Germany, Italy, and France, and originated, according to most critics, in the famous monastery of Saint Gall.

If we place ourselves at the standpoint of regularity and of order, the introduction of *tropes* in the office books was no doubt a mistake, but the doctrines contained in the *troparia* were unassailable, and for the history both of ideas and of the monastic life they are extremely curious, to say nothing of the influence they had on the progress of sacred music. The details M. Gautier gives us on these several subjects bring to light many facts which were not generally known, and which commend themselves to the attention of readers interested in liturgical literature.

That is not all. If we may believe M. Gautier, the mediæval tropes became in the twelfth century rhymed songs, and losing their original sacred character, they were used by the *goliardi* (boon companions) of the day as the means of turning into ridicule the highest authorities both in Church and State. Finally the tropes may be considered to have originated the 'mysteries,' the '*jeux*,' and the other dramas, which, either in Latin or in the vernacular language, amused the public during the mediæval period, and prepared the way for compositions of a more secular character.

Our author has studied the various collections of tropes known to exist; he gives numerous extracts from them, together with fac-

similes of the pictorial illustrations and the music, which adds so much to their interest. We are glad to understand that a second volume, treating of the theology and doctrinal teaching of the tropes, is in active preparation and will shortly be published.

*Science et psychologie : nouvelles œuvres inédites de Maine de Biran.*  
Publiées avec une introduction par ALEXIS BERTRAND. (Paris : Leroux, 1887.)

THE volume which M. Alexis Bertrand has just published, and which forms part of a scientific review issued at Lyons, will be hailed by all readers fond of serious and wholesome literature. In the present state of philosophical studies on the other side of the Channel it is more than probable that even the name of Maine de Biran is unknown to the great majority, for Maine de Biran is closely identified with spiritualist teaching, and a public thoroughly given up to scepticism, agnosticism, and irreligion is not likely to set any value upon works which treat of psychology, God, and the Infinite. And as we were mentioning the word *irreligion* just now, is not the condition of France at the present time a conclusive proof of the utter inefficiency of philosophy to take the place of religion in moulding the character of man, directing him in the right way, and preparing him for eternity? After the complete *tabula rasa* made by Voltaire, Helvetius, and the *Encyclopédistes*, it was fondly asserted and believed that natural law, as the French called it, or theism, would be quite sufficient as a rule of life. We need scarcely say how this proved a signal failure. Later on, Royer Collard, Ampère, Maine de Biran himself, and quite recently Victor Cousin, endeavoured to show that spiritualist philosophy was doing the same excellent work as revealed religion, and that all the problems of life were answered equally well by the one as by the other, only in a different manner. The futility of these pretensions has now been sufficiently demonstrated, and although they never gave up metaphysical research, the three philosophers we have named above were to the end firm and consistent Christians.

*Le plus grand des philosophes français depuis Malebranche*—such is the designation applied to Maine de Biran by Victor Cousin—has written a great deal, but by some kind of fatality his works were published in a fragmentary and incomplete state, and several of them are still *inédits*. The present instalment comprises a number of distinct essays, the chief of which are (1) a disquisition on Dr. Gall's system, (2) a commentary on the *Méditations métaphysiques* of Descartes, (3) an inquiry into the relations existing between natural science and psychology. The author's object in these various fragments is to show, contrary to the school of Condillac, Cabanis, Volney, &c., that sensationalism alone does not give the key to human nature, and that the existence of the soul is quite as real as the action of the nerves and the circulation of the blood. Maine de Biran is never tired of repeating that man is a free being, and not a piece of mechanism, however deftly put together, unconscious and irresponsible. The reader will find this idea as the keynote throughout the whole volume ; whether the immediate topic discussed is the relation

between cause and effect, the definition of what is mainly phenomenal by opposition to realities, or the nature and conditions of the will. All these facts seem to us very like truisms, and never was it more urgent to re-state them than at the present time.

*Revue de théologie pratique et d'homilétique.* No. 2, October 1887.  
(Paris: Fischbacher.)

THE *Revue de théologie pratique et d'homilétique* marks a new and most interesting departure in the periodical literature of French Protestantism. Until quite recently the reviews and journals published by the reformed churches on the other side of the Channel were, with the exception of the *Revue chrétienne*, remarkably dull and uninteresting. Entirely absorbed by local news and by gossip of the most trivial character, they addressed themselves to a comparatively limited circle of readers, and were very little known to the Christian world at large. The editors of the *Revue de théologie pratique* have wisely thought that the questions of the day deserve to be seriously studied by those who are concerned in the establishment of God's kingdom upon earth, and that the discussion and settling of these questions should not be left to so-called philanthropists, who would do away with religion altogether, and who boast that they recognize neither God nor master. As the title of their publication sufficiently proclaims, they would be, above all, *practical*, and, leaving exegesis and textual criticism to erudite reviews, they place themselves at the standpoint of social and, to a certain extent, of political life.

The second number of the *Revue de théologie*, recently published, illustrates very well the real character of the work, and deserves a brief notice here. The opening article, 'A quoi servent les riches?' is an attempt to answer the vehement attacks so constantly made now against capitalists and owners of property. The author, M. Gide, professor at Montpellier, endeavours to show both the fallacies under which the moneyed classes are labouring, and the best way for them to prove that they feel the duties they owe to society, and that they are eager to discharge those duties. It is a severe denunciation of wanton luxury, and an earnest appeal to those persons who, possessing ample means, should devote them to the promotion of useful undertakings, and to enterprises calculated to benefit the world at large.

Amongst the articles of the *Revue de théologie* having a more distinctly theological, or rather *liturgical*, character, we would name the one on the reading of the Holy Scriptures in churches. This part of the service has always seemed to us particularly open to objection in the French and Swiss religious communities, where the sermon is considered the principal element in the service, and where the reading of the Bible is generally left to a layman, in most cases ignorant or careless. M. Dadre, author of the article, proposes sundry reforms which are certainly much needed.

*Le Talmud de Jérusalem, traduit pour la première fois par* MOÏSE SCHWAB, *de la Bibliothèque Nationale.* Vol. X. (Paris : Maisonneuve, 1887.)

*Revue des Etudes Juives.* Tome XV. No. 29. (Paris : Durlacher, 1887.)

HEBREW studies are represented in France this month by two important publications, which we shall notice successively. The one is M. Moses Schwab's translation of the Jerusalem Talmud, vol. ix. ; it comprises the treatises *Baba Zamma*, *Baba Mecia*, *Baba Battra*, and *Sanhedrin* (i-vi), and discusses civil law, as all Hebrew students sufficiently know. One more volume remains to be published, which will contain the concluding part of the treatise *Sanhedrin*. This book is specially taken up by the rules of criminal procedure, and by the institution of various courts and tribunals. Custom law, as practised and understood by the Jews, was most intricate, and surrounded by difficulties of every kind. The Talmudist writers are the first to acknowledge this ; hence the insertion of many curious legends brought together as parallel cases and subjects for historical comparison ; examples of the most varied kind are also quoted, and aphorisms illustrating the history of civilization. If we confine our attention to the state of Jewish law we cannot help noticing the extreme care taken of the accused persons, especially those guilty of capital crimes. From the point of view of linguistics a number of curious remarks might also be made ; on the knowledge of Greek, for instance, a great discrepancy exists between the different interlocutors named in the text, and in one passage the ignorance of the rabbi is quite amusing. If we have a fault to find with M. Schwab's translation it is that the notes are barely sufficient.

The *Revue des Etudes Juives* is the other contribution to Jewish lore that we have to mention ; part 29, only just published, is equal in interest to the preceding ones, and appeals equally to the archæologist, the historian, and the literary critic. Under the heading *Revue* we have specially noticed an article by M. Israel Levi on the death of the emperor Titus. The author looks upon the reputed cause of that event as a mere fiction introduced to illustrate by a striking example the vengeance which God wreaks upon criminals, and he quotes two texts containing legends to be found with some slight differences in Chinese and Mahometan literature. The *Notes et Mélanges* are as varied as usual ; we would mention more particularly the first one, referring to the sarcophagi discovered in the neighbourhood of Saïda (Sidon) by Handi-Bey, curator of the museum at Constantinople. M. Derenbourg, author of the article, dwells on the monument of Tabnit, and gives the inscription it bears, together with an illustrative comment. The bibliographical part of the Review has also its distinct interest ; it contains, amongst other items, a review of the works of M. Gustave d'Eichthal, an intelligent and accomplished French scholar of Jewish origin, who died in Paris a little more than a year ago. Some of these essays, treating of Biblical subjects, are characterized by opinions of a rather advanced kind, as the saying is ; but the one



devoted to an inquiry into the origin and composition of the Book of Deuteronomy deserves to be specially singled out, because it maintains on that subject views diametrically opposed to all the received ones. Let us notice, in conclusion, M. Reinach's excellent lecture on Jewish coinage, illustrated, as it is, with woodcuts. It ought to be issued separately for the benefit of the general public.

*Through Central Asia*: with a Map and Appendix on the Diplomacy and Delimitation of the Russo-Afghan Frontier. By HENRY LANSDELL, D.D., author of *Through Siberia and Russian Central Asia*. With seventy-four illustrations. (London: S. Low and Co., 1887.)

DR. LANSDELL has been well advised in issuing this popular edition of his admirable work on Russian Central Asia. For the general reader the present volume contains a far more ample description of the regions he traversed than any other book with which we are acquainted, and he has brought his account down to the date of publication by a clear and succinct summary of the events which led to the definite settlement of the Afghan frontier, and of the manner in which the delimitation has been performed. As we noticed *Russian Central Asia* on its first appearance, we will not repeat our commendation of Dr. Lansdell's work beyond saying, for the benefit of those who did not read the earlier edition, that the story of the author's remarkable journey loses nothing of its interest as told in the volume before us. It would be hard to find a narrative more replete with striking incident and stirring adventure. We should not forget to state that the numerous allusions to patriarchal and Persian customs, which throw much light on Biblical ethnography, are all retained, and some further engravings are added in this fresh edition.

Dr. Lansdell seizes the opportunity of this new issue to discuss two questions of much interest. His account of Russian prisons in *Through Siberia* occasioned considerable surprise and some incredulity. A traditional belief was current in England that the Russian administration of justice was stained with cruelty, and horrible stories of the sufferings inflicted by the knout supplied some of the choicer morsels of school-boy literature. National prejudice, not too kindly disposed to our chief rivals in the East, readily accepted anything to the disfavour of Russia; and Dr. Lansdell tells us that his testimony has been called in question—not only on the testimony of Prince Krapotkine, who, as an escaped Nihilist, speaks with the authority of experience, but also on that of the description given in the popular story of *Called Back*. Dr. Lansdell effectually exposes the errors contained in Mr. Conway's clever fiction, and so disposes of evidence which should never have been summoned on a serious issue. Nor is he less successful in dealing with Prince Krapotkine's strictures and socialistic theories. Whilst touching upon this topic, we cannot forbear to quote an extract upon the Nihilist movement, with which we entirely agree, and which is capable of application nearer home. It is frightful to learn that quite young girls are

craftily enlisted in the Nihilist cause, and urged on to deeds of terrible daring. These poor creatures

'find themselves, at the outset of their careers, bound by oaths, to be broken at the risk of sudden and secret death should their courage fail, or should they hesitate to obey. Here lies the real and ruthless tyranny; and the cowardly plotters, skulking in some foreign land, are alone responsible. One reads with a feeling of loathing and disgust an appeal to humanity from such cowardly assassins' (p. 275).

The second question which Dr. Lansdell handles is what he terms, with alliterative humour, the diplomacy, delimitation, and discussion of the Russo-Afghan frontier. How rapidly this subject has been brought within the area of practical politics is forcibly illustrated by the fact that the present writer heard Mr. Disraeli—during the late Lord Derby's last tenure of office—dismiss the subject with the remark that large maps would show how needless it was to contemplate such a contingency for many years to come. We are much indebted to Dr. Lansdell for a perspicacious *résumé* of the blue-books, and for an interesting account of the mode in which the line of demarcation was finally determined; but we cannot acquiesce in the view which he adopts either as to the conduct of Russia or as to the importance of the point at issue. Even this brief summary of the negotiations is sufficient to emphasize a marked contrast in frankness of dealing. The empire of England has steadily advanced in Asia, but we find no indication that it has been pushed forward in defiance of pledges solemnly given to the Czar's government; whilst, on the other hand, England's embarrassment has invariably been Russia's opportunity, and the advance of her frontier will be found uniformly to synchronize with some serious preoccupation of Great Britain in other quarters of the world. Dr. Lansdell closes his amusing 'discussion,' alternately from the Russian and the English standpoint, with the sarcastic conclusion that both nations have been needlessly 'squabbling for selfish ends over a worthless territory.' Yet surely it was not the possession of a barren tract of land, but the establishment of a neutral zone, which was the object in view. This has now, we trust, been satisfactorily accomplished, and, so far as human foresight can provide, will make for that peace which, with him, we most earnestly desire. It is the glory of the Russian Government that it has abolished slavery, suppressed brigandage, and rendered thoroughly secure thousands of miles of territory which a few years since were impassable for Europeans. So rapidly does the railway and the telegraph follow her flag, that no future traveller will encounter the varied incidents which sparkle so pleasantly in Dr. Lansdell's most attractive book.

*The Story of the Nations.* 1. *Alexander's Empire.* By JOHN PENTLAND MAHAFFY, with the collaboration of ARTHUR GILMAN.  
2. *Carthage, or the Empire of Africa.* By ARTHUR J. CHURCH.  
(London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1886-7.)

THESE books are two members of a series which is to give in a short and attractive form the main facts of the growth of the chief

nations of all times. We confess that we are inclined always to look with some suspicion on books of this kind. They suggest forced and hasty work, done not from interest in the subject or to meet a known want, but extorted by an advantageous offer from a publisher. And neither of these books inclines us to think any better of the system : both are the work of well-known writers, and in both the writing is much below what the authors generally produce.

Professor Mahaffy's book has one great merit : it is the only work in English devoted entirely to the subject of which it treats. We hope it will not long remain without a competitor. Professor Mahaffy himself, too, has one great merit as an historian, he is never dull. On the other hand, he has two great faults : in writing for schoolboys he has chosen to write like a schoolboy, and he cannot or will not tell a story simply or directly. The facts are uniformly correct, and the main critical points of the history are well marked, but there is no attempt to give a clear narrative of what really happened. This is especially to be regretted in a period when the course of events is often so complicated. Characters are introduced without any explanations of who they are ; striking anecdotes are referred to as known, where they ought to be narrated—*e.g.* the account of the interview of the Roman ambassador with Antiochus. The book reads like a mass of half-finished essays mixed with fragments of conversation. The author seems to forget that his duty is to tell facts in an interesting manner to ignorant boys. He is so frightened of being dull that he omits the facts, and then refers to them as if his readers would know as much about them as he does himself.

The best part of the book is the chapter on Alexandrian literature and the account of the social condition of the people. As a political guide the author is not successful : he entirely omits any preliminary consideration of the causes or meaning of Alexander's expeditions. Even assuming a good knowledge of previous Greek history in the reader, some summary of the relations of Greece and Persia is absolutely indispensable. It is, again, most misleading to illustrate the state of Greece in 180 B.C. by that of Ireland now. He is also much too fond of calling names : Aratus is dismissed as a 'wretched traitor,' Philip and Perseus are introduced as 'a selfish tyrant and penurious fool.' This is obviously the result of hasty writing, where any striking expression is put down without consideration ; but it is just the kind of thing which a schoolboy can do for himself without having the example set him. The style, too, is uniformly bad, chiefly from the same reason—carelessness and haste. It is always weak, sometimes colloquial to a quite inadmissible extent, occasionally ungrammatical and almost unintelligible. One continually comes across high-flown sentences and sentiments which prove eventually to be absolute nonsense. Take the following rhapsody on the death of Alexander's son :—

'To us the child is but a name, and yet so tragic from his every fortune that few of the greatest sufferers, whose heroic sorrows are known to all, can claim a higher place in the hierarchy of human martyrdom' (p. 53).

An absolutely essential addition to the book is a full chronological table and clear genealogical tables. Neither of these is to be found.

Professor Church's book is much better, and there is not much to be said about it. He tells his story correctly, generally without much enthusiasm. There are one or two passages of considerable descriptive power, but as a rule the author has not quite succeeded in bringing out the full interest of the narrative; he is too conscious of his predecessors in the same field to be quite at his ease. In one place where he is narrating the first of the expeditions of the Carthaginians at the end of the fifth century, there is a very careless and obscure bit of writing:—

'At the very time when Selinus was taken, the advance guard of the Syracusan army reached Agrigentum. They tried to make terms with the conquerors' (p. 30).

It is extremely difficult to know to whom 'they' refers.

The books are cheap; there are not many misprints; the maps, however, are few in number and roughly drawn. A full-page map of Sicily ought to accompany the history of Carthage to make the account of the many wars intelligible. In the other volume we should like to see a series of small maps showing the different divisions of the empire at various epochs. The map of Greece, too, is scanty; we notice, e.g. that Chalcis, in Euboea, is omitted.

*Wiclif: an Historical Drama.* (Oxford: James Thornton, 1887.)

THE readers of *Bertha* will probably be surprised by this new work by the same author. The readers of the preface also will be probably pleased, in a few cases perhaps disappointed, when they get on to the play itself. For the play is a simple, straightforward tragedy, without any great poetical imagination or unwonted power of language, but written obviously with great care and great restraint. The characters are sympathetically drawn, and great pains has been taken to make the poem a complete whole. Where the author fails most is in the representation of the political and social movements. He is at his best in the purely domestic scenes; and there is considerable pathos in the last act, which represents Wiclif in retirement and dying. There is a certain amount of power about the book, a good deal of feeling. The one thing that is wanting, both in the play itself and in the lyrics which accompany it, is any faculty of beautiful versification.

*English Men of Letters.* Edited by JOHN MORLEY. *Keats.* By SIDNEY COLVIN. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1887.)

THIS is one of the best and most interesting of this excellent series. It supplies, too, an important want. Lord Houghton's is so far the only good life of Keats, and that is not generally accessible. There is probably no poet whose reputation has so gradually and so steadily increased as has that of Keats, and now that his great merit is so generally recognized it is most desirable that there should be some short and standard biography easily attainable.

This is the more important in Keats's case, because of the false impression of his character which has become prevalent. Professor Colvin shows how false it is to suppose he was a weak, sentimental man, who was killed by a review. As a matter of fact he died of consumption, which was in the family, and was brought on by exposure during a walking tour.

The events of the life itself are so few, and the life of the poet was unfortunately so short, that Professor Colvin is able to treat it with greater detail, and to give more careful criticism of the works, than is the case in most of this series. He gives a useful and interesting account of Leigh Hunt and his circle, but at the same time shows how little Keats was really in sympathy with their political objects.

Very valuable, too, is the account of the influence on his style of different writers—especially Leigh Hunt, Spenser, and Dryden—and the way in which as his powers developed he outgrew the mannerisms fashionable at the time. What makes the book particularly useful is, that though it is written with full appreciation of both the poet's character and writings, there is none of the indiscriminate praise and abuse which are so common among weak admirers of poets who had the good fortune not to be appreciated too soon. Mr. Colvin's very high praise is all the more valuable that he points out what faults there are even in the most beautiful of Keats's poems. The only drawback to the book is perhaps a tendency to give too much importance to some new discoveries and a certain amount of new material which he has been enabled to use, and which would be rather more in place in the pages of a literary journal than in a popular series of this kind.

*A Popular History of the Ancient British Church, with special Reference to the Church in Wales.* By E. J. NEWELL, M.A. (London: S.P.C.K., 1887.)

MR. NEWELL'S book on the history of the Ancient British Church consists mainly of papers contributed to a Cardiff parish magazine, and is intended to present the history of the ancient Welsh Church in a popular form. It has many decided merits. It is written with constant reference to original authorities, and with the help of the best modern works. The fact that the writer refers throughout to Haddan and Stubbs's *Select Charters* inspires confidence, which is further corroborated by the soberness of judgment which makes him refuse to admit legends as historical facts, even when he narrates them as evidences of the spirit and thought of the Church which produced them. He is at home, too, among the ancient sites of Wales, and adds vividness to his papers by his description of the sacred places and remains (unfortunately only too scanty) of the old Church.

But, if Mr. Newell has learned the critical duties of the historian, he is less skilled in the constructive: he has none of that faculty of grouping isolated and unmeaning facts together into one whole; he does not connect the history of the British Church with the secular history of the times, or with the history of the Church as a whole.

We learn a great many facts. We never get a general picture drawn for us.

The work will be very useful, however, as a faithful history, and in relation to the present ecclesiastical troubles an account of the origin of the Welsh Church would help to remove some misconceptions. Unfortunately those who labour under misconceptions are very inaccessible.

BRIEF NOTES ON NEW BOOKS, NEW EDITIONS, PERIODICALS, &c.

SINCE our last issue, the *Classical Review* (London: David Nutt, 1888) has entered on its second volume, Nos. I. to IV. of which are now before us. This publication ought to have a wide circulation, for it furnishes matter to gratify the tastes and meet the wants of classical scholars in every conceivable department of classical literature. The contents are thoroughly sound, sensible, and practical. The style is terse and simple, without a shadow of an attempt at 'padding.' The summaries of periodicals, at home and abroad, must be most useful. We may single out, as of special interest, the account in the March number of 'Classical Education in Germany,' on the same lines as the paper last July on 'Classical Studies in France.' We may also mention, in the April number, the first part of what promises to be a very *piquante* exposure, by S. Reinach, of an archaeological forgery, viz. the so-called Asiatic Terra-Cottas. In the same number we find a review (which more especially concerns us) by Dr. Plummer of Dr. Ellicott's edition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians. The reviewer quotes in full Dr. Ellicott's note on the words τοῦτο ποιεῖτε and endorses it in the following words:—

'In short, to quote this text in support of the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist is only in degree less unwise than to quote the passage about the Three Heavenly Witnesses in support of the doctrine of the Trinity. Supposing that St. Paul and St. Luke did *not* mean to suggest any sacrificial meaning, what word would they have been more likely to use than ποιεῖν?' (p. 115).

On this, with all due deference to a scholar so distinguished as Dr. Plummer, we venture to remark: 1. The passage in St. John's First Epistle, v. 8, seems to us to differ less in 'degree' than in kind from 1 Cor. xi. 24, where there is no question of the reading of different manuscripts. 2. Why does Dr. Plummer elect to ignore what might be almost called the *contemporanea expositio* furnished by the two passages in Justin Martyr, as well as the evidence of the Early Liturgies (see *Church Quarterly Review* for July 1886, vol. xxii. pp. 324-330)?<sup>1</sup> 3. If St. Paul and St. Luke *did* intend a sacrificial meaning, what word would they have been more likely to use than

<sup>1</sup> In this connexion, we observe with surprise and regret (if we may be pardoned for saying so) that Canon Mason (*Faith of the Gospel*, p. 309) does not indeed ignore, but puts on one side—as it would seem—as irrelevant, the very important testimony of Justin Martyr, and goes so far as to speak of 'the rendering "offer this" . . . as of recent origin'! Can the early liturgies—to say nothing of Justin Martyr—be properly spoken of as 'of recent origin'?



ποιεῖν? See the long catena of examples of this use of ποιεῖν in the Appendix to Bishop Hamilton's famous Charge (p. 99 of the reprint).

Encouraged, we may presume, by the success of the *Classical Review*, the same enterprising publisher has issued the first number of *The Archaeological Review* (London: David Nutt, 1888). It is further entitled 'A Journal of Historic and Prehistoric Antiquities,' and is intended to combine Anthropology, Archæology, History, and Literature. The field of inquiry selected cannot be chargeable with undue narrowness. The 'Editorial Note' is signed W. Lawrence Gomme. But another 'note' seems also to be signed in an editorial capacity by Mr. Edward B. Tylor. Both of these, it may be said, are good names to conjure with; but we shall await the issue of one or two more numbers before we offer an opinion on the merits of this somewhat ambitious venture.

The *English Historical Review* (London: Longmans, 1888) pursues the even tenor of its way—not so much the highway as the by-paths of history—under the able and scholarly editorship of Professor Creighton, who steadily refuses to descend from the higher platform of solid and serious historical investigation to the more popular treatment of subjects of the day and of the hour. The most interesting article in this January number is devoted to a critique, by Mr. G. W. Prothero, of *Gneist on the English Constitution*. It certainly is most extraordinary that a German writer who has done so much to promote the study of English institutions should have remained for nearly forty years without being translated into English. And alas! if the translation now issued—if we may judge from Mr. Prothero's remarks on it in another part of the Review (p. 161), and from the criticisms which have appeared elsewhere—be so bad, its publication is to some extent a matter for regret. Mr. Robertson Smith's review of M. Renan's *Histoire du Peuple d'Israël* will be read with curiosity, and will amply repay the reading. He seems to consider it a very unsatisfactory performance.

Another Review has still stronger claims at our hands. Three-fourths of its title is borrowed from ourselves. We refer to the *Indian Church Quarterly Review* (The Oxford Mission Press: Calcutta, 1888). It is edited by the Rev. A. Saunders Dyer. Not content with borrowing our title, the Editor also borrows the language used by us when we first started as descriptive of our aim and object. *So long as the 'borrowing' goes no further*, we have assuredly no cause to complain. We can only be too thankful that Church life in India is so vigorous as to afford reasonable ground, as we presume, for hoping that such a Review will meet with adequate support. Mr. Donald J. Mackey's article on 'Church Music in India' does not seem to us to be a very valuable production. We cannot understand why the editor did not draw his pen through a 'puff,' in that article, of 'Mr. Henry Jones, of Fulham Road, as a most conscientious manufacturer [of organs] who will supply the best material for fair prices' (p. 35). A few lines lower down there is a misprint, 'orders' for 'organs.' The Rev. Nehemiah Goreh (a converted Brahmin) contributes 'A Letter to Cardinal Newman,' which was posted in

Bombay in July 1886, but which 'has not received any acknowledgment.' The venerable Cardinal's advanced age may sufficiently account for his silence. The writer endeavours to tackle the Cardinal on the subject of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin and on Papal Infallibility! The chief interest of this article is due to the nationality and antecedents of the writer. If we might make a very small suggestion, it would be that the 'running title' at the top of the pages should vary with the article. We must not omit to mention that by far the most powerful and the best written articles in this number are by the Right Rev. the Bishop of Calcutta, on 'Church Organization and Church Life,' and by the Rev. C. W. Townsend on 'Unity in the Indian Church.'

Foremost among 'new editions' must be mentioned the seventh issue of Mr. Keble's edition of the *Life and Works of Mr. Richard Hooker*, 3 vols. (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1888), revised by the Rev. R. W. Church, Dean of St. Paul's, and the Rev. F. Paget, D.D., Professor of Pastoral Theology. Twenty-five years have elapsed since the sixth edition. Scarcely could the present revision have been confided to more competent hands. An interesting addition, now made for the first time, is a facsimile of a page of a manuscript of the fifth book, purchased by the Bodleian in 1878 and collated by Dr. Paget for this edition. The manuscript is not, unfortunately, holograph, but the page here photographed has a note of seventeen lines in Hooker's hand. Issued and revised under such favourable auspices, this must now more than ever be the edition of the great English classic and divine, who, to use Mr. Hallam's language, 'not only opened the mine but explored the depths of our native eloquence.' It ought to be on the shelves of every clergyman's library: and ought not to remain there. But alas! we hear it whispered that the clergy do not read nowadays as they were wont to do when Mr. Keble first gave to the world his edition of Hooker, more than half a century ago (1836).

A second and amended edition of *Social Arrows*, by Lord Brabazon (London: Longmans, 1887) has reached us. As may be inferred from the title, these arrows are aimed at some of the many social problems which cry for a solution in these days of overcrowded and under-educated populations. One or two of these papers have been reprinted in a volume not written but edited by Lord Meath (as Lord Brabazon must now be called), entitled *Prosperity or Pauperism? Physical, Industrial, and Technical Training* (London: Longmans, 1888). It consists of a Series of Papers, Letters to Newspapers, Addresses, &c., on the subjects specified. We may name as one of the most interesting of the series an account, by Miss Chapman, of the 'Slöjd' or Handwork Schools of Sweden, which certainly seem to be doing an excellent work, both physically and morally.

Messrs. Griffith, Farran, Okeden and Welsh have added four more of their shilling (!) volumes to their *Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature* (London, 1887-8). They consist of (1) *Platina's Lives of the Popes to the Accession of Gregory VII.*, edited by the Rev. W. Benham, B.D., F.S.A., in whose preface we may note

in passing the misprint of 'Vessarion' for 'Bessarion.' Mr. Benham's notes are judiciously few, and always useful. (2 and 3) Baxter's *Saint's Rest* (2 vols.), with an admirable preface by 'the Editor,' who shows that he is keenly alive to the weakness as well as to the strength of Baxter's position. (4) William Law's *Serious Call to a Serious and Devout Life*, with a preface by W. B. (whom we can scarcely be wrong in identifying with the editor of *Platina*), which scarcely does justice to the literary power of what we may call an English classic. Gibbon said that some of the portraits in the *Serious Call* 'were not unworthy of La Bruyère.' We sincerely trust that the publishers may meet with the due reward of their enterprise.

We rejoice to find that we are promised a complete collection of *Miscellaneous Essays*, by R. W. Church, Dean of St. Paul's (Macmillan and Co., 1888), some of which, we observe, are taken from our own pages. 'Le style,' says Buffon, 'c'est l'homme même.' The elevation of thought and of character, which we seem instinctively to associate with the present Dean of St. Paul's, finds its natural vesture, so to speak, in the well-adjusted drapery of words and sentences which, like the drapery of Greek sculpture (to use Goethe's expression), is a 'thousandfold echo of the form.' We shall look forward eagerly to the subsequent volumes. In the volume now issued we have: 'The Essays of Montaigne,' 'Brittany,' 'Cassiodorus,' 'The Letters of Pope Gregory I.,' 'The Early Ottomans.'

All will be interested—for must not all die?—in a little book called *Euthanasia, or Medical Treatment in Aid of an Easy Death*, by William Munk, M.D., F.S.A. (London: Longmans, 1887), written with a 'tender grace' which befits the subject, and which is only what we might expect from the author. It abounds with wise suggestions which, if attended to, would smooth the pillow of many a deathbed.

The *Dublin Review* (London: Burns and Oates, 1888) always contains something worth reading, and the January number forms no exception. The second portion of 'The Jews in France' sustains the interest of the first. 'The Gospel and the Gospels' gives an able summary of the results arrived at by 'Father Coleridge' in harmonizing the Gospels. 'The Teaching of the Twelve Gospels,' by Dr. J. R. Gasquet, is interesting as exhibiting the light in which that work is viewed by devout and learned Roman Catholics.

In a former number we called attention to a work entitled the *Via Crucis*, of which the third edition, 'revised, enlarged, and illustrated,' has recently been published. We have now to speak of a companion volume called the *Via Lucis: Nine Meditations on the Exaltation of Christ, from his Resurrection to his Ascension, with accompanying Hymns, forming a Companion to Eastertide and Sequel to 'Via Crucis,'* by the Rev. S. J. Eales, M.A., D.C.L., with eight illustrations (London: Elliot Stock, 1888). The work is characterized by the same earnestness, yet withal sobriety of devotion, which marked its predecessor, and we hope it may run through as many editions. We cannot agree with Dr. Eales in his interpretation of the words 'he saw and believed' (St. John xx. 8), however imposing

may be the names he can quote on his side ; and we entirely disapprove of the illustration given of the Ascension without any indication of the presence of the attesting witnesses. Both these works are full of valuable suggestions to preachers at Lent and Eastertide.

*The Relics of St. Thomas of Canterbury*, by the Rev. John Morris, S.J. (Canterbury : Hal. Drury, 1888), effectually disposes—in our judgment—of the notion that the bones recently discovered were those of Thomas à Becket. We are very glad that Father Morris has put together his scholarly researches in a convenient form, and with suitable illustrations.

*Progress of the Church in London during the last Fifty Years*, by the Rev. W. Walsh, M.A. (London : Rivingtons, 1888), is a jubilee publication which would have been noticed, if it had reached us, sooner. We have called it a jubilee publication, but we could wish it had been somewhat less jubilant in tone. We read with some little impatience of the 'Church of England having made *giant strides* in the metropolis . . . in rising to her responsibilities,' when we think of the rioting and drunkenness of an English Good Friday, and of the countless hordes in the slums and alleys of London who lie outside the pale of Christianity in any shape or kind. However, this need not detract from the value of the book as a *résumé of facts* which appear to be grouped together with accuracy and judgment.

Following the example of the Wolverhampton Church Congress, the *London Diocesan Magazine* (London : Griffith, Farran, Okeden, & Welsh), February and March, 1888, admits the lucubrations of Mr. H. H. Champion to its pages, in a paper called 'Should Christians be Socialists?' We doubt whether the experiment will be repeated by a Church Congress, and we hope the same of the *L.D.M.* The March number contains an illustration of the new reredos at St. Paul's, but without any *criticism* of the work.

As we are going to press, we have put into our hands the *Breviarium Romanum a Francisco Cardinali Quignonio editum et recognitum juxta editionem Venetiis A.D. 1535 impressam*, curante Johanne Wickham Legg, Societatis Antiquariorum atque Collegii Regalis Medicorum Socio, in Nosocomio Sancti Bartholomæi olim Prælectore (Cantabrigiæ: Typis atque Impensis Academiae, 1888). We have only time and space to return our warmest thanks to the Syndicate of the Cambridge University Press for this invaluable reprint of the Quignon Breviary. We trust they may be encouraged by this latest venture, coming as it does so soon after their Sarum Breviary, to persevere in extending the resources and the treasures of the students of Liturgiology. We also congratulate them on having secured the services of so competent and accomplished an editor as Dr. Wickham Legg. We hope to say more of this work on a future occasion.